

THE SCHOOL REVIEW MONOGRAPHS
ISSUED IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE SOCIETY OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION

NUMBER V

Rating, Placing, and Promotion
of Teachers

Educational Surveys

List of Educational Investigations
by Members

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

LIBRARY

.....November 22..... 1919

No. ^{Ed} 370.6
~~N21c~~

x.5. copy 2

Rating, Placing, and Promotion of Teachers
Educational Surveys
List of Educational Investigations
by Members

PAPERS BY

FRANK E. THOMPSON, WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK, LOTUS D. COFFMAN
A. S. WHITNEY, W. S. SUTTON, EDWARD C. ELLIOTT, GEORGE
F. JAMES, PAUL H. HANUS, M. B. HILLEGAS
G. D. STRAYER, I. L. KANDEL
CARTER ALEXANDER

PAPERS PRESENTED FOR DISCUSSION AT THE MEETING OF THE SOCIETY
OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF EDUCATION, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA
FEBRUARY 24, 1914

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY
NUMBER 10



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

LIBRARY OF
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

COPYRIGHT 1914 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

—
All Rights Reserved
—

Published February 1914

204

55

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE RATING, PLACING, AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT	I
FRANK E. THOMPSON	
THE RATING OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS	12
WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK	
THE RATING OF TEACHERS IN SERVICE	13
LOTUS D. COFFMAN	
THE PLACING OF NEW TEACHERS	25
A. S. WHITNEY	
A PLAN FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SECTIONS FOR THE PLACING AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS	31
W. S. SUTTON	
A PLAN FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN STATES FOR THE PLACING AND PROMOTION OF EXPERIENCED AND MERITORIOUS TEACHERS	37
EDWARD C. ELLIOTT	
THE ADVANTAGES OF A STATE TEACHERS' AGENCY . . .	41
GEORGE F. JAMES	
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CITY SCHOOL SURVEYS FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION .	49
PAUL H. HANUS	
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STATE SCHOOL INQUIRIES FOR COL- LEGE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION	57
M. B. HILLEGAS	

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT SCHOOL SURVEYS .	62
G. D. STRAYER, I. L. KANDEL, and CARTER ALEXANDER	
LIST OF INVESTIGATIONS BY MEMBERS	73
CARTER ALEXANDER	

THE RATING, PLACING, AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS—INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

FRANK E. THOMPSON

Professor of Education, University of Colorado

Last year the matter of the rating, placing, and promotion of teachers was brought to the attention of this Society in an informal report which made in a general way the following propositions:¹

Certain unhappy conditions attaching to the teaching profession are in large part to be charged to defective methods in placing and promoting teachers. Most prominent among these conditions are: insecurity of tenure; itineracy; lack of vital relationship between teachers and community; unprofessional conduct on the part of teachers; the failure of teachers to grow in grace and power; time serving; insufficient salary. To minimize such evils is serious and pertinent work for educators.

Three main lines of activity in the way of improvement were indicated as fairly obvious, all three to be undertaken through inter-institutional and interstate co-operation: (1) careful determination and statement of facts, causes, and effects of the evils enumerated, the relation of these evils, for example, to teachers' agencies, the various forces now effectively at work to improve conditions; (2) the devising and perfecting of a nation-wide scheme for placing and promoting teachers—a scheme which will to some extent ameliorate bad conditions through saving the teacher's soul and money; (3) a nation-wide discussion of the ethics involved in seeking, accepting, or leaving a position, and in seeking, employing, promoting, or discharging a teacher. It would seem that reasonable educators, teachers' agencies, and citizens in general, after full discussion, might agree to at least the propositions and implications of such a code, for example, as the following:

1. Poor teachers should not receive positions as long as there are better teachers without them.
2. The more expert teachers should be in the more difficult positions.
3. The more difficult positions should be relatively the better paid ones.
4. The individual genius of the teacher should fit the peculiar requirements of the position.
5. Teacher and position should fit each other in such a way as to conserve the ethical, moral, and professional spirit of the teacher, and especially of the new teacher.

¹ *School Review*, May 1913, pp. 350 ff.

6. There should be promotion, but only for meritorious service.
7. Change of position should be subject to the satisfaction, always, of at least three requirements: (a) the good of the school the teacher is leaving; (b) the good of the school to which the teacher goes; (c) the professional good of the teacher making the change.
8. Personal and political "pull" or influence must be eliminated from all appointments; merit and adaptation are the only legitimate considerations.
9. Teachers of equivalent preparation should be kept in active competition with each other.
10. The method of bringing teacher and position together should be such as to exert an influence upward on salaries and for security of tenure; at the worst should never tend to work against these ends.
11. "To Whom It May Concern" or similar testimonials should never be written; and no teacher should ever be the custodian of these or any other testimonials descriptive of himself.
12. Superintendents and others in authority over teachers should not get rid of undesirables by writing glowing testimonials in their behalf.

At that time the Executive Committee of the Society was empowered to appoint a committee or committees to undertake investigations and make further report. Owing, no doubt, to unavoidable delays, a committee was not appointed until October, in consequence of which this paper and the ones which follow have been prepared in a wholly inadequate time by exceedingly busy men and amid the press of professional duties. Neither the introduction nor any of the other papers purports to be in any sense a finished effort. There has been no time for a great amount of important investigation (if we would deal with facts rather than opinions) and barely time to put a few impressions together in even rough form, but the importance of the whole subject is such that, as against deferring longer, even this kind of beginning is felt to be desirable. Probably, however, it may in fairness be said that the investigations needed are not so important for the determining of conditions (which are obviously bad), as for indicating possibilities and limitations in the improving of conditions. It is attempted in what follows to call attention again to the situation, to indicate the importance of immediate steps looking toward improvement, and perhaps in a small way to suggest what the first of these steps should be.

The committee appointed consists of Lotus D. Coffman, Illinois;

Ellwood P. Cubberley, Stanford; Edward C. Elliott, Wisconsin; George F. James, Minnesota; William H. Kilpatrick, Columbia; W. S. Sutton, Texas; Frank E. Thompson, Colorado (chairman); and A. S. Whitney, Michigan. This committee by correspondence agreed that the most obvious aspects of the subject assigned, "The Rating, Placing, and Promotion of Teachers," be dealt with in papers, one important aspect to be treated by each member of the committee, and each paper to be: (a) an exposition of the importance of the matter—a discussion of principles; (b) a definition of the problem or problems; (c) a qualitative (and as far as possible a quantitative) estimate and description of the present conditions and their bearing upon present education and civilization in America; (d) a plan for a more careful "survey" and analysis of conditions; (e) a scheme (even a utopian scheme) for improvement. This paper and those which follow indicate the topic chosen and the choice of writers. It was further agreed to prepare by correspondence a comprehensive plan for study, propaganda, and legislation with a view to the betterment of conditions, and submit it to this Society to be adopted by it or urged upon the National Education Association. This plan could not be prepared in time for printing in the *Yearbook*, but will be in shape for the meeting in Richmond.

A naïve student of things human from, let us say, some other world, observing things educational in this country, would be impressed no doubt by a number of things, but among them I feel very sure he would not fail to be impressed by the following unfortunate things:

1. That each year a great many teachers begin teaching who have not made adequate preparation for such beginning; that most of these beginners are women, or rather, young girls; and that men are very scarce in the ranks of these beginners—many of these few being of a sort to entitle the profession as a whole to the designation, "The Third American Sex."

2. That a very large number of teachers, while not entirely new to teaching, are new to their present position; perhaps half of the teachers of the country are obliged for a few months each year to consider matters of the communities in which they find themselves,

entirely extrinsic, rather than their more genuinely educational problems.

3. That a very large number of those in "new" positions have left as good or better positions in which they were beginning to be really useful.

4. That a great many have paid for the exchange of position (often for very slight service indeed) sums varying from \$20 to \$50 or more, and have been put as well to the expense of moving.

5. That a great many have stayed on in positions in which they have done good work, but have not received an advance in salary because teachers seemed to be plentiful.

6. That a great many have left positions—and often teaching altogether—because they received no encouragement either in advance in salary, in status, or in appreciation, again because teachers appeared to be plentiful.

7. That a great many teachers who are fairly well fitted to continue teaching quit it each year for occupations for which they are not much if any better adapted and which pay little if any better either in money or status.

8. That each year a great many arguments and influences are used by teachers and their friends, and some who are not their friends, in behalf of or against candidacies, which arguments and influences are often non-pertinent and, too often, impertinent.

9. That a great deal is said each year of the influence of book companies, teachers' agencies, and other institutions in connection with particular changes and appointments; the talk is bad for the profession, even if there is no truth in it—it is much worse if there is truth in it.

10. That there is for several months each year, in many communities, a great deal of vapid discussion of the teacher by pupils and their parents, largely because he is "new."

11. That a great many make a beginning each year under such conditions that they cannot possibly succeed in a large way, if at all, because of social maladjustment, or because required to teach subjects for which they are not prepared; while a few miles away other teachers are as badly situated, and an exchange all around, if it were possible, would secure relatively good adjustments.

12. That a great many each year are disheartened or discouraged altogether with teaching who, had they had a reasonably good chance, would have been enthusiastic instead and worth often many times as much to education.

How much the deeper conditions, of which the things we mention are but conspicuous surfaces, affect our civilization it is perhaps impossible to say, but there can be no doubt that it is more than a little. The undignified scramble for positions is more or less apparent to every child in the schools and that fact alone must in great measure weaken the authority (in all its senses) of the teacher over the pupil. But there are other and even more deadly forces at work: the teaching body does not present a dignified or even an undivided front—obviously, there is much petty criticism and even, not infrequently, apparent covetousness of others' positions; contracts are often lightly broken; even to a child's observation, and very often, the teacher is not selected for fitness; the virtuous not infrequently are discharged or left unrewarded and those who compare but badly with them are retained or preferred; the teachers, even the principal and superintendent, are often obliged to be their own promoters; the ear is often to the ground when it should be listening for whispers from the sky. All these things, and more, children witness from the earlier years—even up to the high schools. Can it be doubted that such observations deeply affect character and character standards? The teacher is one of the most conspicuous items in the child's experience, and the matters of which we speak, if they are part of the teacher's conduct, are conspicuous indeed.

That there is tremendous waste of professional possibility resultant from such a condition, no one who seriously considers the matter for a moment can reasonably doubt. Take itineracy alone, for example. No other profession, or calling, or line of business, or social undertaking could begin to maintain a proper *esprit de corps* if it suffered anything like the same change in personnel in a like period of time. The largest element in professional, or artisan, or artist, or teacher spirit (where it exists) is the spirit of comrades, of those intimately associated for some considerable time. The value of the right spirit on the part of the teacher toward the job

and the rest of the profession is so great that all things else added together are not equal to it as a force in causing children to learn. We prepare teachers as carefully as we can, and we have made great advances during the past few years, and then, too frequently, we leave them to the mercy of purely adventitious circumstances; happily, sometimes, to find those places in which much of what we have helped them to get in the way of professional spirit and enthusiasm is conserved; unhappily, too often, to get into places, in which much or all of it is lost.

If all these instances, and many more which might be mentioned, be studied with a view to the discovery of their causes, I am convinced that in the case of most of them the causes will be discovered to be fairly common, in fact three much interwoven causes are responsible for most of them. These three causes seem to be: (1) an irrational, unjust, non-constructive method of securing schools for the beginning teachers; (2) a similarly irrational, unjust, non-constructive, and unimaginative method of promoting teachers and of changing them, in case of failure to fit, to positions in which they will fit; (3) a not very thoughtful, not very careful, rather sketchy, "temperamental" way of rating teachers—so much is this the case that there is no scheme common to any considerable territory; the very words used in description of "general" qualities mean different things. It might perhaps be fairer to speak of the absence of method in these three connections; the activities indicated are not really anybody's business. Teachers (and some who are not teachers) want positions; schools want teachers; both begin to look about; one or the other, or both, cry, "I spy," and the thing is done—so, often, are the children—and the teachers—and the schools—and the profession.

While the situation is undeniably bad, there are numerous tendencies and institutions at work for better things. In choosing topics for the papers which follow, an attempt was made to some extent to get discussion of movements in which there are already hopeful beginnings or opportunities. The whole movement for more scientific, accurate estimation—measurement—of things educational is helping and will continue to help. Taking our cues from this movement, we should soon secure a careful report upon a

common terminology in the description of teachers and upon the rubrics under which the teachers' qualities should be graded. There could be rubrics of the "essentials," as personality, scholarship, and technique, and of the "additional desirables." There should be full discussion of the means of rating: whether rating should be merely upon opinion, as it chiefly is at present, or upon results achieved by pupils, or both. The rating of those who have never taught, except perhaps in a practice school, is one matter; the rating of those who are in service is another matter; different standards will have to be evolved and agreed upon. The accurate rating of the prospective teacher is of chief importance to the end of determining the kind of position to which he should be appointed, where, other things being equal, he will make the best beginning in the calling. He should go to a position which he can handle and handle in such a way as to fix and improve his ability as a teacher. It is a matter of very common observation with all of us that a great many who give (to our unscientific observation) excellent promise while still in training do not later come up to expectations; I believe much of this failure is due to untoward conditions in the first position. Two of the papers planned for this report deal with "rating."

The work of the various "Bureaus" or "Appointment Committees" for the recommendation of teachers is, in general, very good. An inquiry sent out last year brought in information from which it is fair to assume that practically all of these committees make a conscientious effort to fit teacher and place one to the other. That they so frequently fail is due to the inadequacy of reliable knowledge and standards much more than intentions. There is fair agreement (as shown by sample blanks) concerning the chief desirable qualities of teachers but such agreement seems to result more from imitation of one committee by another than from arrival at fundamentals (and therefore identities) through study. The same fair agreement seems to obtain in methods of procedure. In general, the method of discovering possible positions is unsatisfactory. There is practically no provision to prevent a wholesale competition between committees, agencies, and individuals for every opening that appears. As a step toward improvement here, it

ought to be possible to make up a manifesto covering these matters (and those of professional ethics) which would be agreed to by all committees and which could then be put into the hands of those registering with committees. It could also be printed generally. One of the papers in this series discusses a typical "Appointment Committee."

Although there are practically no formal or even conscious agencies concerning themselves with the promotion of teachers, there are many genuine promotions accomplished by the working of informal forces—I had almost said by natural and artificial selection. We are at least beginning to be conscious that we have not paid much attention to the matter—that we have not realized how much logical and fairly rapid promotion means, or may mean. It may perhaps be pointed out in passing that promotions, to some extent, should be made in view of the ideal that there should be as little newness introduced as possible. The teacher should know the community activities, the social, economic, and political ideals, the educational status, and similar matters thoroughly, and he would have no small advantage if he knew to some extent the same things and others of the families from which his pupils come. The plans of the committee include a report on this subject.

Provincialism is bad in most matters; it is particularly bad in professional matters. Before any section of a state, or any state, can go far in respect to the matters we are discussing, it must be in a position to profit by the good fortune of neighboring sections or states or to extend its good fortune to them. County and state boundaries do not much hamper the movement of teachers (and, ideally, should hamper them still less), the activities of placing agencies, and the spread of unprofessional practices. We can combat evil tendencies and eliminate inefficients only by better understandings and more common practice between sections and states, especially with regard to grades of and minima for certificates, the rights conferred by teachers' and agencies' licenses, the specifications of unprofessional conduct. Co-operation, publicity, and work for legislation will accomplish the first two, and skilfully conducted publicity the last. Improvement in conditions would be still more rapid if several other kinds of information could

be made more common: the range and average of salaries; the range and average of the cost of living; the general character of the teaching conditions—advancement of pupils, size of classes, condition of equipment, etc.; the security of tenure; and the mean level of intelligence in the teaching body. Much of this our journals and foundations are giving us. There should be the friendliest exchange of teachers, principals, and superintendents from section to section and from state to state for the sake of the stimulus to school systems from new blood and to the educators from a larger field and its opportunity for usefulness and promotion. Obviously, such interchange if not put upon a plane of high motives and practices may lead to diminishing returns. Two of the papers in this report treat of this subject more in detail.

There are some good teachers' agencies, there are some relatively good ones, there are some downright bad ones, but there is one thing that can be said of all of them alike—they are an unnecessary expense to the profession. Not one of the good things they do but we could do for ourselves in a far better and cheaper way if we would but take the trouble to organize the latent guild spirit in the most of us. We could get on nicely without the bad things—and so could those who do them. Agencies do do some bad things—in some communities a great many. Some of these things they do with selfish intent, some in the nature of things, some inadvertently. Chief among their sins are: the spreading of the impression among teachers that they can get them positions or better positions; the spreading among employers of the notion that they can furnish them teachers or better teachers; the gathering, in general, and the presenting, of only good accounts of those registered with them; the collecting of sums far in advance of the value of the service rendered, especially in some particular cases where damage has been done rather than service rendered; the putting and keeping of such a matter as the call to teach upon a commercial basis. The final paper in this report deals with a substitute for many of these evils.

The American right to do anything has given our girls, and men, too, a right to teach school, and a right to change position, and a right to get new positions, by any effective means. The situation

for the most part has "just growed." As in everything else in America, opportunities have been, as it were, left lying around for exploitation. If teachers want to change positions, why not help them to do it expeditiously—and charge for the help? If teachers want certificates, but have not time to spend in preparation, why not give them preparation in a hurry or supply it by testimonials? If a teacher's English will not pass muster, so that it is unsafe for her to apply for a position over her own signature, why not write an application for her—and charge for it? If there is a teaching position open in the neighborhood and one has a "pull," especially if with a member of the board of directors, and be possessed of a girl who needs the money, or know one whose family needs the money, why not give the girl the job? If a superintendent have on his hands a teacher a bit difficult to get rid of, especially if she be related to some of the directors, why not write a glowing testimonial which will help her to get a job elsewhere? Why not promote her? If a teacher is downright bad, even, why not write a non-committal sort of testimonial which will stress the fact that she can sing, or is an addition to the social life of the community, or is a good Christian girl, and then leave it to the fates to see to it that she does no more harm than some others? These are the reasons, and others like them, that the rating, placing, and promotion of teachers is unsystematic and often almost, if not quite, criminally negligent of the interests of children. The condition came about quite without design on anybody's part, but has flourished riotously. It is continued in part for the great human reason that to discontinue it would cause a severe wrench to, if not the complete destruction of, many a pocket nerve. It is continued also because of conservatism, but it is continued chiefly because no one has as yet pointed out, in any thoroughgoing way, the ramifications of its unhappy effects. We, the natural persons to take account of it, have been too busy preparing teachers to pay much attention to them after their preparation. Probably nearly every one of the abuses would disappear after a thoroughgoing campaign of publicity and the offer of rational substitutes for the present methods.

There is already a great deal of machinery in operation—much of it is excellent and much of it is doing excellent work. What is

needed now is some scheme or understanding or both for co-ordinating, and improving, and widening the influence of this machinery. Probably we need both a scheme and an understanding. The understanding might be helped along a great deal by some species of bulletin or journal issued at frequent intervals and devoted primarily to the discussion of this class of problems. Such publication could give publicity to the work of the various committees on recommendation of teachers and the news of changes and promotions. What we need is a movement of not less than national scope for a better ethics for teachers, especially in regard to conduct incident to applying for, accepting, holding on to, and resigning positions. Such a movement tactfully initiated and tactfully advertised would shortly do a great deal to correct abuses and unintentionally bad practices. The fact that such a movement was national would fix attention upon it—would give it prestige. It might well take the form of a code or creed which would set up certain standards for certification, number and form of applications, minimum salaries, avoidance of contract, solicitation and possession of testimonials, etc. Such a creed, if rightly made public, would be certain to be discussed and then it would inevitably happen that it would be largely improved and widely, even though not generally, adopted. To the writer's mind, this is a relatively simple piece of social, or if you prefer, professional engineering. About all that is needed for the achievement, quite commonly, of moderately high standards is agreement among a few "leaders" to subscribe to certain statements and then publish and republish them. Such a body as this is in a position both to formulate the creed and to see to its frequent publication in all parts of the country. Here in America we must have a "program" acceptable on its merits rather than on the fiat of some central authority. The most we could hope to secure, even if we felt it to be desirable, would be the fiat of individual states and this is not enough. We must have purposes, standards, rubrics, tests, methods, and understandings good for teachers and pupils and acceptable on their merits to all concerned in all sections of the country. This "program" in tentative form at least should be worked out in fear and trembling by some body of men. What more natural body can be found than this?

THE RATING OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK

Assistant Professor of the History of Education, Columbia University

THESES

1. With the present state of knowledge, quantitative measurements are not sufficient to furnish a satisfactory basis for the rating of prospective teachers.

2. The best available rating is the judgment of the instructors expressed on the single item of the comparative promise of success of the several candidates.

NOTE 1.—Let the candidates be grouped according to destination, as kindergartner, primary teacher, intermediate teacher, etc.; let each instructor arrange the names in the several groups according to promise of success, all things considered. Let the appointment officer compile final rating lists, considering that the judgments of the instructors are not necessarily of equal weight.

NOTE 2.—As auxiliary information, useful to the appointment officer (1) in evaluating discordant judgments, (2) in adapting candidate to vacancy, and (3) in describing candidates to prospective employers, let each instructor also report, on a convenient scale, such data regarding each candidate as (*a*) vigor, energy, and initiative, (*b*) good sense, judgment, tact, (*c*) personality (including likableness and refinement), (*d*) knowledge of the subject-matter in the instructor's field, and (*e*) promise of growth.

3. The practical judgment of the appointment officer is thus a necessary reliance (1) in compiling the several lists, (2) in comparing this year's graduates with their predecessors, and (3) in selecting the particular candidate for a specified place.

THE RATING OF TEACHERS IN SERVICE

LOTUS D. COFFMAN

Professor of Education, University of Illinois

To know precisely what qualities are demanded in successful teaching and to be able to determine them with a relative degree of accuracy constitutes a rather severe demand upon supervisors. The rating of teachers and the criticism of instruction represent specialized functions that should be performed only by those whose training and experience render them competent to exercise the functions intelligently. Perhaps if more care were displayed in these particulars the general reaction would greatly increase the efficiency of the teaching corps.

In view of the fact that the teaching population is recruited annually by approximately 100,000 untrained people, the school administrator is compelled to assume the responsibility of familiarizing them with both the materials and the technique of teaching. Much as he may shrink from the employment and application of a scheme for measuring the efficiency of his teachers, he invariably, more or less consciously, classifies both the recruits and the old teachers in terms of efficiency levels. Some teachers are considered excellent, others good, others poor, and others failures.

Returns from superintendents over a wide area show that opinion rather than a definite instrument is currently used as the basis for estimating the worth of teachers. Although there is a certain but unorganized mass of knowledge and opinion as to the qualities a superior teacher should possess and as to the character of the results she should secure, superintendents have few quantitative standards that they can consciously employ in checking the efficiency of their teachers. Researches in educational laboratories have provided the progressive superintendent with a number of units and scales for measuring educational results in handwriting, arithmetic, composition, and spelling. That superintendent who refuses them is either crassly ignorant of their significance or grossly

derelict in the discharge of his duty. These units and scales are really impersonal standards not only for determining the individual variation of pupils in given abilities but for evaluating the methods and estimating the accomplishments of teachers. That they put a premium upon individual initiative and resourcefulness is the testimony of both teachers and supervisors wherever they have been used.

But in spite of the achievements of a small group of serious-minded men who have dedicated themselves to the scientific study of education, we have no adequate or accepted scheme for the rating of teachers. There must be a wide array of factors in addition to those measured by the various scales now in vogue that contribute to efficiency in teaching. The names applied to these factors are usually mere blanket expressions that cover a multitude of undefined and subtle qualities. Our ignorance in respect to these factors is appalling. No one knows, as the result of a trustworthy study, how the qualities that constitute merit in teaching should be arranged; no one knows the relative importance that should be attached to them; in fact, no one knows just what the qualities are that should receive recognition by school administrators. The lists that have been prepared are the a priori deductions of fertile minds or the result of a pooling of more or less related experiences. Our progress thus far in this field must be attributed to the sane opinions of wise leaders. But as education approximates a science the demand becomes increasingly insistent that we have a more definite qualitative analysis of the manifold qualities that constitute the efficiency of the individual teacher. Until we have it, we shall not be sensitive to the great variety of uses to which it may be put nor to its place in the general economy of school life.

Any attempt to secure a well-defined standard is complicated (1) by the differences in the standards employed by different school superintendents, (2) by the differences in the relative value placed upon the various items presumed to constitute teaching efficiency, and (3) by differences in the ability of those who do the rating to distinguish between these items.

Letters in my possession confirm the impression that many

supervisors doubt the value of such a tool, even if it can be constructed. These letters also contain an enumeration of the items some superintendents consider in forming lump judgments of their teachers. This list would be interesting but of no scientific value. In some cities score cards of a definite character are in current use. A few superintendents rate their teachers according to the percentage of pupils who pass the term's work. The teacher with the highest percentage of promotions is rated the best teacher, the teacher with the next highest percentage of promotions is rated second best, and so on. It is clear that a teacher would improve wonderfully under such a system. Another prevailing tendency is to rate teachers according to an examination given the pupils. Valuable as this is as a supervisory device, it nevertheless may have the lamentable effect of making the successful passing of an examination the sole aim of instruction.

From recent correspondence I am convinced that there are two common and almost universal fallacies relating to the rating of teachers. One is the naïve assumption that teachers are rated when the range of their ratings on a percentile basis is between 90 and 100 per cent. Generally speaking, when one discovers such a distribution—and they are numerous—he may be reasonably certain that considerations apart from general merit determined it. The general effect of a minimum-wage law or a salary schedule based upon success grades is to raise the grades of all teachers, the mediocre ones relatively more than the best ones. Under such a condition teachers are really not rated; human sympathy due to a consciousness of the inadequacy of teachers' salaries has blinded the critic.

The second fallacy is the assumption that teachers are promoted when their salaries are increased or when they are advanced a grade. A teacher is not promoted because her salary is increased; promotion means a change of station, a higher rank. If a teacher remains in a certain grade throughout her entire career but is given higher rankings from time to time because of increased merit, she may in all justice be said to be promoted. If she remains continuously in the same grade without receiving a better rating, although her salary may be increased, she is not promoted. It is

not uncommon to hear of a teacher being "promoted up through the grades." This is a false interpretation of the term and is likely to lead to vicious results, because it places undue emphasis upon the importance of certain grades. One grade should not be regarded as better than another or as higher than another so far as teaching is concerned. A teacher who is shifted from a third to a fourth grade is not promoted, and a teacher who is shifted from a fifth grade to a fourth grade is not demoted. They are simply assigned to other grades.

Seventeen of the largest cities in the United States state definitely that they have no special scheme for the grading and promotion of teachers. The general practice in these cities as well as in many others is to advance the salaries of teachers in accordance with an automatic salary schedule. The operation of this schedule depends almost entirely upon the term of service. A few cities like Boston and Baltimore hold promotional examinations. Others like Fall River, Milwaukee, and Providence make probationary appointments. Others pay their teachers according to the grades they teach, the average number of pupils belonging in the grade or building the previous year, or the percentage promoted. Apparently every imaginable kind of a device is in use somewhere.

A number of random attempts have been made in recent years to investigate these chaotic conditions and to arrive, if possible, at a more adequate description and placing of the factors that contribute to teaching efficiency. Most of the earlier investigators solicited the opinions of pupils about their teachers.¹ There is little evidence in these studies that the investigators secured any information of fundamental importance. However, they must be given credit for doing pioneer work and for accumulating material that is rich in suggestions. These studies were followed by others, two of which I wish to describe in greater detail, in which information was secured from superintendents and principals about their teachers. So far as I have been able to determine, none of these has modified practice in the least. Two things have contributed to their failure to function: (1) none of them was sufficiently com-

¹ H. E. Kratz, *Studies and Observations in the Schoolroom*, chap. v; W. F. Book, "High School Teachers from Pupils' Point of View," *Pedagogical Seminary*, XII, 238.

prehensive to warrant its universal acceptance, and (2) the traditional conservatism of the schoolmaster predisposed him to use the methods sanctioned by long experience. Until an investigation is made that is not open to serious criticism and until supervisors can be convinced that the use of a scale will not destroy the spirituality of the teacher, we cannot hope for a marked change in the present mode of supervisory practice.

There are but two published accounts, so far as I know, of attempts to define scientifically the qualities that determine efficiency in teaching. The first of these was conducted by Professors Ruediger and Strayer.¹ Principals and supervisors were invited to rank their teachers in their order of general merit and then to rank them upon eleven items, arbitrarily selected by the investigators. The most important table in this study, rearranged so as to show more definitely the relation the various items bear to general merit, appears below (Table I).

TABLE I

General Merit	No. of Cases	Range	Median	Average	M.V.	R.E.	Pearson
1. Control or ability to keep order.....	25	0-100	22	22	12	11	56
2. Teaching skill; method.....	26	0-70	17	23	15	13	54
3. Initiative or originality.....	26	4-53	25	25	11	8	50
4. Strength of personality.....	26	0-70	25	27	13	11	46
5. Progressive scholarship or studiousness.....	24	0-53	30	28	12	11	44
6. Ability to carry out suggestions.....	24	0-50	25	29	10	10	42
7. Accord between teachers and pupils.....	26	0-60	33	31	10	10	38
8. Experience in years.....	25	10-60	29	32	11	8	36
9. Social factor outside of school	23	10-66	36	36	11	7	28
10. Personal appearance.....	24	10-61	44	40	10	7	20
11. Health.....	18	6-67	50	48	10	7	4

While there is some reason to believe that the above correlations are all too small, there is no good reason to believe that a greater number of cases would seriously modify the relative order of the items. The investigators point out that both the mean variation and probable error are large, hence there can be little central tend-

¹ See "Qualities of Merit in Teachers," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, I, 272-78.

ency in any of the correlations. Although this table gives a very real notion of the part each of these factors plays, it is not maintained that the foregoing list is a complete catalogue of the qualities that determine general merit. Remembering that the conclusions are tentative and suggestive, we find in the following table (II) a fair notion of the relationship these factors bear one to another and to general merit:

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ITEMS MEASURED SO AS TO SHOW THEIR RATIO OF INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING GENERAL MERIT

General Merit	Control	Teaching Skill	Initiative	Personality	Studiosness	Carrying Out Suggestions	Accord	Experience	Social	Appearance
Teaching skill.....	1.01									
Initiative.....	1.12	1.08								
Personality.....	1.20	1.17	1.08							
Studiosness.....	1.27	1.22	1.13	1.04						
Carrying out suggestions.....	1.33	1.29	1.19	1.09	1.04					
Accord.....	1.47	1.42	1.34	1.21	1.16	1.10				
Experience.....	1.55	1.50	1.39	1.28	1.22	1.18	1.05			
Social.....	2.00	1.92	1.80	1.64	1.58	1.50	1.34	1.30		
Appearance.....	2.80	2.70	2.50	2.30	2.20	2.10	1.90	1.80	1.40	
Health.....	14.00	13.50	12.50	11.50	11.00	10.50	9.50	9.00	7.00	5

Reading from the top down, ability to control is roughly 1.01 times as important as teaching skill, 1.12 times as important as initiative, and 1.20 times as important as personality, in determining general merit. It is not claimed that the foregoing figures are absolutely correct; and yet the internal evidence in this and other investigations leads us to conclude that some such relationship exists.

This investigation of Professors Ruediger and Strayer stimulated Mr. A. C. Boyce, a graduate student at the University of Illinois, to conduct a similar one on the qualities of merit in secondary teachers.¹ Mr. Boyce mailed 235 copies of Professor Elliott's tentative scheme for the measurement of teaching efficiency to superintendents and principals with instructions that they mark

¹ Boyce, "Qualities of Merit in Secondary Teachers," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, March, 1912.

the teachers by relative position.¹ He received 38 replies from 14 states. Eleven of these were discarded because they were incomplete. The smallest number of teachers rated in any report was 5; the largest number, 23; the total number was 404.

Mr. Boyce's table of coefficients is reproduced because it contains the only published material that is comparable with the Ruediger and Strayer study.

TABLE III

General Merit	Rank	R.	P.E.
Instructional skill.....	1	90	0.059
Success of pupils (results).....	2	85	.059
Stimulation of individuals.....	3	80	.06
Intellectual capacity.....	4	71	.06
Governmental skill.....	5	67	.059
Co-operation.....	6	66	.061
Studiosness.....	7	65	.059
Interest in life of school.....	8	64	.062
Initiative.....	9	62	.06
Executive capacity.....	10	62	.06
Adaptability.....	11	59	.06
Interest in life of community.....	12	57	.064
Self-control.....	13	52	.06
Stimulation of community.....	14	52	.066
Energy and endurance.....	15	51	.059
Voice.....	16	50	.059
Sympathy—tact.....	17	45	.059
Fair-mindedness.....	18	45	.062
Sense of humor.....	19	44	.059
Experience.....	20	43	.053
General appearance.....	21	36	.059
Health.....	22	18	0.062

The difference in the arrangement of the qualities in the two investigations is probably due to a difference in selective agencies at work in the two departments of the school. High-school teachers and grade teachers may represent two different species of the same population. The difference in the size of the coefficients may be explained by the difference in the methods employed in computing them. That there are marked similarities in the two investigations is obvious to anyone who takes the pains to compare them. When Mr. Boyce's coefficients are converted into a table (Table IV) to show the ratio of the importance of the respective items to general merit, the divergences are greatly reduced.

¹ See *Twelfth Yearbook* of the National Society for the Study of Education for a copy of this list.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF ITEMS MEASURED SO AS TO SHOW THEIR RATIO OF INFLUENCE IN DETERMINING
GENERAL MERIT AMONG SECONDARY TEACHERS

General Merit	Instructional Skill	Success of Pupils	Stimulation of Individual	Intellectual Capacity	Government	Co-operation	Studiosness	Interest in School	Initiative	Executive Capacity	Adaptability	Interest in Community	Self-Control	Stimulation of Community	Energy	Voice	Sympathy	Fair-mindedness	Humor	Experience	Appearance
Success of pupils.....	1.06																				
Stimulating of individual....	1.12	1.06																			
Intellectual capacity.....	1.26	1.19	1.12																		
Government.....	1.34	1.26	1.19	1.05																	
Co-operation.....	1.36	1.29	1.20	1.07	1.01																
Studiosness.....	1.38	1.33	1.23	1.19	1.01	1.01															
Interest in school.....	1.40	1.32	1.25	1.11	1.04	1.03	1.01														
Initiative.....	1.45	1.37	1.29	1.14	1.07	1.06	1.04	1.03													
Executive capacity.....	1.45	1.37	1.29	1.14	1.07	1.06	1.04	1.03	1.00												
Adaptability.....	1.52	1.43	1.35	1.20	1.13	1.11	1.10	1.08	1.05	1.05											
Interest in community.....	1.58	1.49	1.40	1.24	1.17	1.16	1.14	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.03										
Self-control.....	1.73	1.65	1.53	1.36	1.29	1.27	1.06	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.13	1.09									
Stimulation of community.....	1.73	1.65	1.53	1.36	1.29	1.27	1.06	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.13	1.09	1.09								
Energy.....	1.76	1.66	1.57	1.39	1.31	1.29	1.27	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.01							
Voice.....	1.80	1.70	1.60	1.42	1.34	1.32	1.30	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.04	1.02						
Sympathy.....	2.00	1.88	1.77	1.58	1.50	1.46	1.42	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.15	1.13	1.11					
Fair-mindedness.....	2.00	1.88	1.77	1.58	1.50	1.46	1.44	1.42	1.37	1.37	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.15	1.13	1.11	1.11				
Humor.....	2.04	1.93	1.81	1.61	1.52	1.50	1.45	1.45	1.40	1.40	1.34	1.29	1.29	1.18	1.15	1.13	1.13	1.02			
Experience.....	2.09	1.97	1.88	1.65	1.58	1.55	1.51	1.48	1.44	1.44	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.20	1.18	1.10	1.10	1.04	1.02		
Appearance.....	2.50	2.36	2.22	1.97	1.86	1.83	1.80	1.80	1.72	1.72	1.63	1.58	1.58	1.44	1.41	1.39	1.39	1.22	1.22	1.19	
Health.....	5.00	4.79	4.44	3.94	3.72	3.50	3.60	3.60	3.44	3.44	3.27	3.16	3.16	2.88	2.83	2.77	2.77	2.50	2.44	2.39	2.00

Mr. Boyce established two other facts not recognized by earlier investigations: (1) that the relationship between sex and teaching efficiency is insignificant, and (2) that there is high positive relationship in secondary schools between teaching efficiency and the subject taught. From best to poorest the order of excellence in teaching is Latin, mathematics, history, English, science, modern languages, and commercial subjects. This is probably due to two things: (1) the older subjects are more firmly fixed as to content and method than the younger subjects, and (2) teachers of the older subjects as a rule are better trained than the teachers of the younger subjects.

Three studies pursued at the University of Illinois supply confirmatory evidence of the validity of the two investigations just described. Mr. S. H. Littler¹ carried on an investigation of the causes of failure among grade teachers and Miss Moses¹ prepared a similar report for high-school teachers. Miss Moses' returns, representing 76 systems in 31 states, were easily classified into the following rubrics:

TABLE V

Rank	Causes of Failure	Number of Failures	Percentage of Total
1	Poor instruction	43	20.97
2	Weakness of personality	35	17.07
3	Lack of interest in work	30	14.53
4	Weakness in discipline	26	12.68
5	Lack of sympathy	20	9.75
6	Inability to co-operate	14	6.82
7	{ Unprofessional attitude	12	5.85
	{ Weakness in knowledge of subject-matter	12	5.85
8	Disloyalty	7	3.41
9	Immorality	4	1.95
10	Poor health	2	.97
	Total	205	99.85

These figures both supplement Boyce's report and show that his frequencies were not entirely accidental. Had the same items been used it is highly probable that an inverse relationship would have been established throughout the two distributions. Mr. Littler's

¹ *Home and School Education*, January, 1914.

rubrics reveal the same situation in regard to grade teachers that Miss Moses discovered among high-school teachers, and complement Ruediger and Strayer's conclusions.

The third of these studies is an attempt by Mr. F. L. Clapp to measure personality (to be published as one of the special bulletins of the School of Education of the University of Illinois). This appears to be a very pretentious thing to attempt and, in some quarters, it may be considered sacrilegious, for personality is assumed by some to represent a supernatural quality that cannot be modified by man's handiwork. Superintendents almost universally place great stress upon personality and quite frequently attribute the teacher's success or failure to this factor. And yet what constitutes "personality" has been a matter of undefined opinion. Because of the divergence of opinion as to its constituents, Mr. Clapp decided that there must be a wide variety of personalities that are good for the schoolroom and that the measurement of personality, therefore, furnishes as real a problem as the measurement of any other personal quality. Accordingly a number of high-school principals, superintendents, normal-school presidents, college professors, and teachers were to name in order of importance the ten most important factors of personality. A hundred persons replied, sending in 978 items. These were grouped under 98 heads.

It is not maintained that this preliminary work of Mr. Clapp's possesses any peculiar scientific merit. As a matter of fact it was almost as unscientific as it would be to ask each of one hundred persons to give a list of the ten books he likes without restricting him to a given list of books. Naturally each would answer in terms of his own library. On the other hand, it must be admitted that there is more agreement as to the elements that enter into personality than there is as to the books found in individual libraries.

Mr. Clapp arbitrarily selected the ten items most frequently mentioned and asked a few representative school men to rank their teachers according to these items and also asked to rank them in terms of general personality and general merit. He received 675 ratings. Unfortunately he requested each superintendent to

rank only the six best teachers. For this reason his returns may describe a select grouping. Still it is barely possible that the six best teachers in one system are no better than the six worst teachers in another system; and consequently his grouping may represent a random sampling.

Combining his material, so as to show the number of times each of the ten elements was mentioned, their relative importance as factors in general personality and in general merit, gives the following tabular summary:

TABLE VI

Elements	Number of Times Mentioned in Possible Hundred	P.C.C. with General Personality	Rank	P.C.C. with General Merit
Sympathy...	58	Address.....0.793	1	Sincerity.....0.751
Personal appearance	57	Personal appearance. .673	2	Fairness......747
Address.....	46	Optimism.... .647	3	Optimism......677
Sincerity....	44	Reserve......597	4	Address......675
Optimism....	42	Enthusiasm... .594	5	Reserve......658
Enthusiasm..	30	Fairness......590	6	Enthusiasm.... .646
Scholarship..	29	Sincerity......556	7	Sympathy......631
Vitality.....	25	Sympathy.... .477	8	Vitality......549
Fairness.....	24	Vitality......474	9	Scholarship.... .543
Reserve.....	24	Scholarship...0.418	10	Personal appearance... .469

It should be remembered that the first column contains general judgments of personality while the other columns represent a study of individual teachers by rankings. It is clear that the material and easily noticeable qualities are most conspicuous in personality and the subtler ones in general merit.

This survey of the literature on the rating of teachers shows that the problem has not been solved. The various investigations present no workable scheme that is likely to be accepted by the practical supervisor. Haphazard opinion has not been displaced by units of measurement scientifically acquired. There has been little or no attempt to duplicate or extend any of the investigations that have been made. Each investigator has worked with the rankings of a particular type of teacher or has focused his attention upon a special phase of the general problem. This means that in

the various investigations there has been no marked effort to preserve a uniform list of qualities. Moreover, so it seems to me, all of the prominent studies have had the same defect in method: *each of them had different judges judging different persons.*

I have under way a personal investigation of the general problem, which, I hope, will dispose of some of these criticisms. A dozen graduate students, who have had experience in teaching, and five recognized expert judges of teachers are now assisting me in rating the teachers in a western city. We are using Professor Elliott's scale of efficiency, because we know of no better and because we believe it better to give universal validity to some one plan than to be constantly devising new ones. My judges are rating each teacher twice at intervals of at least two weeks. The superintendent and principal are also ranking the teachers. From these returns I hope to check the methods employed in previous studies, to determine more accurately the ratio of influence each of the various qualities bears to general merit, and finally to measure the unreliability of a single judge's estimate of teaching ability. This last is a most important consideration, hitherto neglected. Until this is determined we cannot know with any mathematical certainty the weighting that should be given to the various determinants of efficiency. I do not hope to prepare a finished scale, for that would require an enormous amount of labor. Any scale of efficiency must be a measure of the *results* of a teacher's work: that, no one has worked out. It represents one of the dreams of the scientist in education. Nevertheless I expect my returns to shed a little additional light on this important matter.

THE PLACING OF NEW TEACHERS

A. S. WHITNEY

Professor of Education, University of Michigan

The placing of teachers at the University of Michigan is in complete control of an Appointment Committee, composed of the head of the Department of Education, chairman, a junior professor of education, vice-chairman, a secretary, and a clerk. The function of the chairman is purely advisory, the vice-chairman devotes from two to five hours per day during the busy season to the work, while the secretary and the clerk give their entire time to the committee.

As stated, the full responsibility for the placing of teachers at the University of Michigan rests with the Appointment Committee, and therefore whatever merit or demerit, weakness or strength, the system possesses is directly chargeable to it. Being thus free to work out its own salvation the Appointment Committee has gradually incorporated its best thought and experience into practice, and therefore I can conceive of no more practical contribution to make to the topic assigned me, than to give a brief exposition of the methods of procedure of the Appointment Committee as the same have grown up under my supervision during the past ten years. The chief phases of this procedure may be set forth under the following heads:

1. *General meeting of students.*—A general meeting of all students desirous of teaching at the end of the first semester, or at the close of the college year, is held during the second week in November. At this meeting the vice-chairman explains the aims, methods, and ideals of the Appointment Committee; how to fill the blank forms distributed for registration; how to write letters of application; how to meet superintendents, school boards, and other officials; teachers' agencies—their proper and improper functions; the nature, obligations, and sanctity of a contract; the salary that may reasonably be expected; and such other matters as may be of immediate and vital interest to each. It is made clear that while the Appointment Committee will exert its utmost in behalf of every candidate,

it does not promise positions and does not hold itself solely responsible in case of failure. Each one is urged and expected to do something for himself, to seek positions through his own initiative, and to develop a spirit of independent action, it being understood that the Appointment Committee is ever ready to further his interests so far as it may seem wise. The Appointment Committee believes this spirit of mutual responsibility and independence makes for better understanding, greater sympathy, and more successful business.

2. *Registration.*—The general meeting of students is held Monday afternoon. The following afternoons and Saturday morning of the same week are devoted to registration. A capacious room with tables, chairs, ink, and pens is provided for this purpose. Acting under the supervision and advice of the secretary the candidates copy the substance of the “temporary form,” which was distributed at the general meeting, into the “permanent form,” the main items of which are those usually found in registration blanks for teachers—including names of persons who can speak with most knowledge of their qualifications. At this time also the candidate makes triplicate records on small folders, which can be easily and conveniently mailed to inquiring superintendents and school boards. Four unmounted photographs are required of each person registering—one to be attached to the “permanent form” and one to each of the triplicate records. In order to prevent delays registration is free until the fifteenth of November; after this date a fee of one dollar is charged.

3. *References.*—As soon as registration is complete the “permanent form” is filed in a loose-leaf ledger for permanent use, and the triplicate records are placed in envelopes properly labeled with each student’s name and then filed in a suitable cabinet for ready access. These records are then examined and separate lists of the candidates compiled and sent to each member of the faculty given as reference. By prearrangement such reference calls at the office of the Appointment Committee and gives the secretary his confidential estimate of each candidate’s fitness for a teaching position, specifying as minutely as the individual cases seem to warrant. Through these conferences the secretary gains a broad conception

of each candidate's peculiar capabilities and is therefore better fortified to make wise and judicious recommendations to school authorities. The secretary also makes copious notes during these conferences and copies the essentials verbatim into the "permanent form" and triplicate records already mentioned.

At the time of registration, candidates who have received a part of their education in other institutions or who have had experience in teaching are given blank query forms to send to such non-resident references as they may desire, with explicit instructions that all replies should be mailed directly to the secretary of the Appointment Committee. Excerpts from these references are made a part of the records of the office. In no case are these confidential records made accessible to candidates. Formerly these letters of inquiry were sent from the Appointment Committee office by the secretary, but experience has conclusively proven that it is wise to throw responsibility upon a candidate whenever opportunity offers.

From the date of this registration until early spring the office is engaged in collecting data, filing reports, and putting everything in readiness for the busy season.

4. *Interviews.*—The next step in the procedure is the interviews held with the candidates by the Appointment Committee and the superintendents of schools. These officials recognize that much is needed to make a successful teacher besides scholarship, besides the more or less formal data already gathered and transferred to the records, and therefore they endeavor to supplement this knowledge by personally acquainting themselves with the candidates, and judging at first hand of their peculiar fitness for teaching, such as their personality, social adaptability, tact, all around common sense. To this end the Appointment Committee, at the time of the general meeting in November, invites and urges all candidates to frequent the office during office hours, to confer with the vice-chairman and secretary concerning their studies, plans, and ambitions, and in other ways to assist the office in forming a just estimate of their capabilities. In addition, the secretary holds frequent interviews with the Dean of Women, is a welcome attendant at all Senior functions, and gathers information from

many other sources which is invaluable as a basis for recommendation. The vice-chairman likewise gains invaluable first-hand knowledge through his classroom instruction and his chairmanship of student advisers.

Superintendents and other employing agents are urged to visit the university and to interview as many candidates as interest them. Upon their arrival the candidates desired are summoned by telephone, or are gathered from their classes by means of the "Senior location" blank, with little loss of time. In many cases superintendents facilitate matters by notifying the Appointment Committee, in advance, of the day and hour they expect to arrive at the office, the nature of their desires, and the salaries they expect to pay. When this is done several suitable candidates are selected and requested to appear at the office at the time specified. In every case the superintendents are given free access to all the confidential records, and, in addition, are given the benefit of whatever private information may have been gained by the vice-chairman and the secretary. It is a cardinal principle of the committee to be absolutely sincere and frank with all employing officials, let the chips fall where they will.

Each year the number of superintendents and other officials adopting the custom of coming to the university for personal interviews with teaching candidates has increased until it now includes practically all of those of the medium and larger schools of the state, as well as those of many of the smaller cities. Not infrequently superintendents remain two or three days, interviewing candidates, and often they bring with them contracts, signed in blank by proper board officials and ready for execution without delay. This system of direct personal interviews between superintendents and candidates is one of the most effective and satisfactory features of our entire Appointment Committee work.

5. *Recommendations.*—If school officials are unable to visit the university, or if vacancies occur when candidates are at their homes, the committee, on request for nominations, selects from its available list the names of two or three persons who seem best fitted to meet the requirements, and forwards them to such inquiring officials, together with the "triplicate form" records and a brief

letter of recommendation. At the same time the candidates are notified of the action of the committee and requested to make personal or written application to the officials designated. In case the candidates are not interested in this particular position they are expected to notify the committee at once, and other names are substituted. The candidates are usually informed by means of a "notification card" which states briefly the name of the city, the subjects to be taught, the salary to be expected, and the officials to be addressed. If the "call" is particularly urgent, the candidates may be notified by telephone or telegram, or even the recommendations themselves may be telegraphed.

6. *Blank forms.*—As has been indicated suitable offices, efficient secretarial force, and proper equipment in the matter of machines, telephones, filing cabinets, and blank forms are essential to best business methods. The machines and cabinets are of standard make, while the blank forms used can be briefly described as follows:

1. *Temporary forms.*—This blank calls for the complete life and educational history of the candidate, the subject or subjects he wishes to teach, and the names of the persons whom he gives as references. The chief purpose of this form is to indicate to candidates the exact data they will be expected to furnish at registration and therefore they can come properly prepared. This blank is distributed to candidates at the general meeting of all candidates in November.

2. *Permanent form.*—This is a duplicate of the "temporary form" except it is printed on fine heavy paper preparatory to filing in the ledger. On this blank the candidate, acting under the direction of the secretary, transcribes for permanent use the data indicated on the "temporary form." This blank also contains the confidential reports of the references.

3. *TriPLICATE record.*—The triplicate record is a brief digest of the "permanent form" including an unmounted photograph of the candidate. It is arranged in convenient form for mailing to superintendents and school officials.

4. *Inquiry form.*—This form is sent to out-of-town references making confidential inquiries concerning the candidate's scholarship, teaching ability, discipline, personality, and good sense.

5. *Senior location form*.—This form gives the name, city address, telephone number, and daily schedule of each candidate during the second semester of each year. The aim of this form is to aid the Appointment Committee in summoning candidates for interviews on brief notice.

6. *Vacancy form*.—This card is inclosed in letters to superintendents and school officials making inquiries concerning vacancies, the subjects desired taught, the probable salary paid, and other duties and qualifications demanded.

7. *Notification form*.—This is a card sent to candidates notifying them that they have been recommended to teach certain specified subjects in a specified high school at a given salary, and that they should apply to the official named at once.

8. *Index card*.—This is to record data concerning the “triplicate forms” mailed to school officials, as, date of mailing, to whom sent, name of city, name of candidate, date of return, etc.

9. *Follow-up card*.—In case the “triplicate forms” are not returned at a reasonable length of time, a formal follow-up card is sent requesting that it be done at once.

10. *Supplementary registration form*.—This card is for use of those who have once registered, but who wish their records brought up to date. It is for the special use of advanced students and alumni.

All the forms above mentioned are in daily use, and are deemed an essential part of the business of the office.

Conclusion.—This paper has to do with the placing of *new* teachers. It should be stated in this connection, however, that that is the primary function of the Appointment Committee at this university. At the time of the general meeting of candidates above mentioned, this policy is made perfectly clear. The candidates are informed that the Appointment Committee will cordially assist them as alumni so far as it can consistently do so, but that its chief duty, the primary object for which the office was organized, is to guard the interests of the undergraduate—the beginning teacher.

A PLAN FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SECTIONS FOR THE PLACING AND PROMOTION OF TEACHERS

W. S. SUTTON

Dean of the Department of Education, University of Texas

I have been requested by the chairman of the Committee on the Rating, Placing, and Promotion of Teachers to offer some suggestions concerning that phase of the problem relating to co-operation between sections. I regret that the little time at my disposal, as well as other causes, makes a thorough, scientific study of the question impossible, and that, therefore, the suggestions which follow will be of an extremely tentative character, the right being reserved, of course, to adopt hereafter views altogether at variance with the ones here set down. One other preliminary remark: I shall consider the question as relating to the co-operation of sections of the same state, and not of sections of the country at large.

I. THE PRESENT SITUATION

In the placing and promotion of teachers there is at this time almost no co-operation of one section with other sections of any state in the Union. There is no bureau organized and controlled by law to discharge these functions; neither is there, under the control of the teachers, any organization functioning efficiently for them. While some assistance is given to teachers, superintendents, and school boards by faculty committees in normal schools, colleges, and universities, and while teachers' agencies, conducted primarily for the gain of their respective proprietors, perform no mean service, the fact remains that, in the vast majority of instances teachers must depend upon their own initiative to obtain situations. The first position to which the young teacher is called, or rather, the first position which he is able to run down and finally capture, is obtained as the result of merely random activities. The element of chance found in lottery schemes, when compared with that which

exists with the great body of teachers in seizing opportunities for first employment, may be considered a matter of certainty. As a rule, the young teacher's opportunity for service lies within the narrow confines of his own community or his own county. Generally speaking, he is not a graduate or even an ex-Freshman of a normal school, a college, or a university. He is not acquainted with the managers of teachers' bureaus managed by private individuals, neither is he informed concerning the *modus operandi* of the bureaus. He must, therefore, take whatever position chance may afford him, and oftentimes the position obtained is one for which, in many important particulars, he is by no means qualified.

On the other hand, school superintendents and school boards, finding no well-organized agency that will come to their aid in the selection of competent teachers, are, themselves, at the mercy of an unfortunate condition, and must be content with what chance may bring them, also. Perhaps the most difficult and delicate of all the functions of the school superintendent is to be found in the employment of teachers. His personal and professional success, as well as the progress of the schools under his supervision, finds its basis and limitations in the quality of the teaching service. The school board, whose chief executive officer is the superintendent, should follow his suggestions in the election of teachers; but it too often happens that the members of the board, charged with the control of the schools of a community, are of the opinion that their schools are run for the purpose of giving places to the daughters of the citizens of that community. Again, should school boards and superintendents call upon normal schools, colleges, and universities in any given state, it would be impossible to answer their demands, for, while suitable candidates could be recommended for some hundreds of positions, there would be thousands of positions for which no supply would be available.

The situation is really lamentable. So long as it continues, it will be preposterous to consider teaching a profession, for one of the characteristic marks of a profession is that he who practices it is invited to render service, and is not compelled to go out into the highways and compel his fellows to submit themselves to his ministration. Lawyers, I take it, would consider it an insult,

were the governing board of a great corporation to advertise in the newspapers for legal talent, and the whole tribe of reputable physicians would raise their hands in horror if one of their number were to advertise for patients, and they would pass by with utter contempt any advertisement for medical service; but the teacher must find pleasure and bodily sustenance in similar advertisements by school boards and himself. The fact is, that, in gaining pedagogic office in this country, the teacher is at least a near-politician. Woodrow Wilson, for example, being a good Presbyterian, as well as a good Democrat, considered it altogether professional to advertise for the office of President of the United States, notwithstanding the fact that a certain kindly and portly gentleman, who was occupying that office at the time, was likewise informing the American people of a desire to be re-elected. Some people would have us believe that Mr. Wilson was laboring under the inspiration that he had been predestined to oust, by the aid of William Jennings Bryan and a few millions of other American sovereigns, Mr. Taft from his high office. It is true that herein is manifested a kind of co-operation but certainly not a kind that should be exhibited by members of an honorable profession. If there be any one fact more important than almost any other fact in the realm of public education, it is that all things relating to the management of schools be divorced from partisan politics. The people need efficient, expert service in the schoolroom, and, as long as narrow-minded, provincial, unprofessional policies obtain in electing teachers, the people cannot rightfully expect their servants who teach their children to be either competent or faithful.

What has been said heretofore concerning the placing of teachers applies equally well to their promotion, for promotion is, in fact, a form of placing. The field of the teacher's career is, at present, very largely fixed by the locality in which he first begins his service. It is no wonder that the ambitious young man, seeing little opportunity for advancement in the school world, enters upon some other avocation, and nobody can blame a bright and enterprising young woman for accepting, as soon as possible, any desirable suitor for her hand. When teachers and other people are finally convinced that more sanity and more system should be introduced into the

important business of placing and promoting teachers, the present individualistic policies will give place to those marked by the co-operative spirit, a spirit which is distinctly characteristic of modern civilized life.

2. A TENTATIVE PLAN FOR CO-OPERATION

The public-school systems in America are state systems. If the state has the right to tax her people in order to raise money for teachers' salaries, for buildings, grounds, and school supplies, and if she has the right to devote large sums to the preparation of men and women for professional service in the schoolroom, it does seem reasonable that she should, furthermore, extend her activities in the direction of the proper placing and promotion of teachers who are at work in her school system. She should surely be as much concerned with the qualified teacher's having an opportunity to give to her his best service as she is with qualifying him for that service. If she is perfectly willing to spend hundreds of dollars for the latter purpose, common business prudence suggests that she should, likewise, be even eager to make generous contribution to accomplish the former purpose.

If the contention of the preceding paragraph be sound, then the state should establish and place under the control of her department of education a bureau which should render continuous service in the placing and promotion of teachers. The records of this bureau should contain comprehensive and accurate information. This information could be obtained from school superintendents, city and county, school principals, school boards, as well as in some instances even from laymen. To this bureau, as to an educational clearing-house, school boards, superintendents, teachers, and all others concerned could come for reasonable and substantial service. The bureau should not be expected to exercise authority in either the placing or the promotion of teachers, for in America there is a well-founded prejudice against bureaucratic control of public schools. If the local interest of the people in their own schools is to be preserved, local responsibility and local authority must not be swept away. It would seem, therefore, to be the duty of the state bureau merely to serve as a helpful intermediary

between candidates on the one hand and school superintendents and school boards on the other. The work of the bureau should be done, furthermore, as indicated above, at state expense; but, possibly, a small registration fee, to guard against the intrusion of idle and worthless applicants, might reasonably be charged. It is important, however, that no money consideration serve as a motive in determining the suggestions given by the bureau.

Substantial aid in the administration of the work of the bureau might be received from teachers' aid committees of the state teachers' association, and from similar committees of teachers' associations of the several sections of the state. It is probable that the bureau might stimulate into greater activity and efficiency the work of the committees already in existence. What such committees now accomplish is practically a negligible quantity, for they function at rare intervals, and with data altogether insufficient to guarantee results worthy of commendation.

Teachers' committees in normal schools, colleges, and universities could be brought to the assistance of the bureau, for they could give reliable information concerning the qualifications of students who desire to become candidates for teachers' positions. The testimony given concerning any candidate by one of these committees could, with proper discretion, be transmitted to the superintendent or the school board in search of an acceptable teacher, and afterward he could direct inquiries to that committee and to other professors who are personally acquainted with the academic and professional status of the applicant. It is perfectly natural that school authorities having competency emphatically in mind will not wish to deal with an impersonal bureau or a mere *factotum*. Such authorities regard the whole business of obtaining teachers to be so important that they will take great pains, and will spend time and money, if necessary, in order that they may be placed in possession of reliable recommendations, and that they may hold one or more reputable persons responsible therefor.

The work of a well-managed state bureau would exercise decidedly beneficial influence not only in leading superintendents and school boards to search for competent teachers, but also upon teachers themselves. Honestly and efficiently directed, the bureau

would gradually lead the great body of teachers to develop professional spirit, to rise to higher academic and professional attainments, and to raise steadily the standards which govern entrance and advancement in the schoolmaster's world. Another by-product, if not a direct result, would be the development of a system of professional ethics, which is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

3. CONCLUSION

In addition to describing the unfortunate condition which now obtains, there has been pointed out in this paper what seems to me one reasonable plan for the placing and promotion of teachers. Other plans and, perhaps, better ones, will be suggested by members of the Association in their discussion of the question. Any rational plan, however, is to be preferred to the archaic methods now in vogue, for, if sensibly administered, it will inevitably guarantee great improvement in the status of our teachers and in the efficiency of their service.

A PLAN FOR CO-OPERATION BETWEEN STATES FOR THE PLACING AND PROMOTION OF EXPERI- ENCED AND MERITORIOUS TEACHERS

EDWARD C. ELLIOTT

Professor of Education, University of Wisconsin

I. THE SITUATION

The situation out of which this discussion has issued appears as a complex of the following elements:

1. *A public-school system¹ characterized by an unmistakable indecision of purpose.*—The absence of a clearly conceived end is to be accounted for partly by the newness of our modern cult of education, and partly by the subservience of the school to the influences of so many undirected forces that make for change merely for the sake of change. The uncertainty of the task to be accomplished has naturally resulted in a marked indefiniteness in the kind and quality of educational service required and secured from the public-school staff.

2. *A probatory profession of teaching.*—The well-recognized inconstancy of the personnel of the teaching craft furnishes striking evidence of selection by circumstance, of training by accident, and of service by chance.

3. *A passive and penny-wise public policy.*—This policy seems to prevent communities from developing a sense of discrimination between time-service and child-service by teachers; and from recognizing that power of performance, personality of influence, and permanence of service must be purchased at a fair price if they are to be had.

4. *An atrophied plan of professional preparation.*—The wide variety of plans and methods by which our numerous training institutions attempt to fit individuals for teaching service but reflects the general indecision of purpose of the public schools.

¹ The brief argument here presented is centered upon the teacher problem in relation to secondary schools. It has, however, a valid application to the other parts of the lower educational system.

5. *A narrow educational provincialism.*—This provincialism, or better, perhaps, territorialism, assumes that personal and professional fitness for teaching are determined and limited by parallels of latitude or state boundaries.

This passing survey may not devise nor weigh remedies for the correction of the difficulties that enter into our problem by reason of these elements. Their presence and influence must be reckoned with, however, before we shall be able to bring about the operation of any scheme that will greatly improve the chances for educational competency to find its true level of opportunity or to receive the appropriate compensations of merit.

II. THE PROBLEM

The axis of the whole issue before us is that there shall be some agreement among ourselves as to theory and practice in the complete professional preparation for secondary-school teaching. The contemporaneous standard of fitness, "college graduate with professional training," means a crude combination of so-called liberal education, formal professional training, vocational necessity, and personal impecuniosity. The first step for any effective co-operation between states in the placing and promotion of teachers is the establishment and acceptance by our leading institutions of certain basic standards for the professional education and selection of teachers. Reciprocity between states in the recognition of licenses, or the uniform classification of certificates, is of minor importance in contrast with the character of the course of training through which teachers are passed. The two decades during which the question of professional training has been under consideration have yielded little more than the mere establishment of departments of education in our colleges, the work of which for the most part has but a remote relation to the real betterment of the status of the teaching craft. We need yet to have a professional definition of the *standard* teacher.¹

¹ It is pertinent to note in this connection that the Report of the Committee of Seventeen on the Professional Preparation of High-School Teachers (1907), while making broad general recommendations for a detailed and specialized study of the subjects to be taught avoids the very practical problem of the constitution of effective

III. THE PROPOSALS

As a practical matter, there seems to be little or no necessity for creating any special machinery for co-operation between states in the placing of inexperienced teachers. The demand for teachers in most of our states is now such as to enable the ready placement of all graduates, qualified for initial appointment, within the state in which the institution is located.

In the case of the few graduates who, by reason of an inherent nomadism, or of residence in another state, desire positions outside of the state, an informal exchange of records and estimates of competency could easily be arranged between institutions. It might be that a standard form for the presentation of these records and estimates could be devised with advantage to the institutions and the individuals concerned.

An organized plan of co-operation for the progressive promotion of teachers who have successfully passed through the minimum period of probationary service would, on the other hand, provide an invaluable means for the general improvement of the permanent minority of the profession, and also serve as the very desirable end of keeping open the avenue of advancement for teachers of demonstrated or potential worth. It is not a simple matter to project the detail of such organized co-operation. It does, nevertheless, seem entirely feasible for this Society of College Teachers of Education to assume the initiative for the establishment of a working plan. This plan would involve, first, a desirable standardization of the preparation of teachers; second, a reliable system for obtaining measures of the performances of teachers; both of these leading to the creation of a preferred list of teachers of guaranteed efficiency. This preferred list, if properly constituted, would be the source upon which high-grade schools might depend for a constant supply of superior teachers.

The co-operative organization suggested would be composed of (a) institutions preparing teachers, (b) secondary-school authorities, preparation in a group of subjects. The fact must be recognized that the actual requirements of service in the American high school, aside from any ultimate educational justification, necessitate teachers being prepared to teach two or three subjects. The academic composition of major and minor preparations and the relation between them is a problem of professional education not yet solved.

and (c) teachers thoroughly sifted on the basis of superior merit. An operating fund would be necessary and might be supplied somewhat as follows: Each institution preparing teachers to contribute an annual fee of \$50 to \$100; each secondary school desiring access to the guaranteed list of teachers to pay an annual fee of \$10 to \$25; and each of the properly enrolled members of the preferred list to pay a fee of \$2 to \$3. I estimate that in the states of the North Mississippi Valley region alone such a fiscal scheme would adequately provide for the support of this organization.

The establishment of a central office for the registration and evaluation of the evidences of merit would inaugurate a new era for the teacher who is a permanent member of the profession. It would likewise afford an instrumentality for the regulation of compensation proportional to competency. It would effectively stimulate communities that now fail properly to reward service. It would likewise guard schools and children against the invasions of individuals and institutions, the quality of whose work is too much determined by a high order of pretense. It would, above all, I believe, tend to diminish the detrimental influence of a sort of Gresham's Law that now operates in the profession of teaching.

THE ADVANTAGES OF A STATE TEACHERS' AGENCY

GEORGE F. JAMES

Professor of Education, University of Minnesota

If the position of United States Commissioner of Education should unfortunately become vacant tomorrow, it is quite impossible that the Secretary of the Interior should turn to a teachers' agency for suggestions as to a successor. Equally impossible is it to conceive that the governing board of any prominent institution of higher learning should turn to such an agency for information as to desirable men for a vacant presidency. As to teaching positions in higher institutions the same situation prevails, and no university administrator would search for a new instructor of his force through the medium of a teachers' agency of the commercial type. Normal-school presidents and superintendents of high schools should be hardly more inclined to seek this kind of assistance in the selection of teachers. Even in the case of rural- and graded-school positions, appointment comes today more and more frequently through the direct investigation by supervisory officers of teachers or prospective teachers than through the intervention of the commercial agency.

A parallel to the development of the familiar type of teachers' agency in this country may be found in the spread of the "business college," which in our American communities represents a device developed with our characteristic ingenuity to solve a peculiar difficulty and continued long after its real usefulness had or should have disappeared. In the early '70's, with the sudden increase of commercial activity and business enterprise in this country, came a demand for a certain superficial facility in bookkeeping, commercial arithmetic, and stenography (to which was later added typewriting), and to answer this demand was organized the business college, soon multiplied into 20, 30, or 40 in a single "chain" extending from the Atlantic seaboard to the Mississippi. These schools served a real purpose for a time, if only in an inadequate fashion. As commercial

courses were later established in high schools and as more progressive communities instituted the special commercial high schools, these, coupled with private foundations offering a real and substantial training, came to fill or should have filled before this the field to the exclusion and therefore the disappearance of the business college itself. A similar story should presently be told of the teachers' agency of the commercial type that is essentially a temporary and was for a time a necessary device to meet a certain situation, to act as a go-between for school boards and teachers desirous of appointment or promotion. The needs of these two parties were measurably served by the teachers' agency, and we may readily acknowledge a comparatively good standard of administration when we consider that the teachers' agency is essentially a business enterprise. We all have known—and some of us for many years—the managers of the better agencies of this type as men of ability, good education, sound character, and usually of such teaching experience as has tended to give them some of the special qualifications requisite in this field.

The teachers' agency conducted as a business enterprise has, however, to a considerable extent, outgrown its usefulness and in part for the following reasons:

1. The function of selecting teachers has passed of recent years very largely from boards of education and school officers into the hands of school principals and superintendents, and these men, given the freedom which rightly belongs to them of searching out the best candidates for the vacancies which occur in their schools, have learned other and better ways of coming upon the material they need than through the teachers' agency. A superintendent who is alert and insistent in looking for good teachers is familiar with the best training schools of different grades in his section of the country and keeps himself systematically informed of the most promising candidates who are there being prepared. He utilizes every large gathering of school people in order to become acquainted with the teachers of various subjects who are highly esteemed in the communities represented. He is in constant touch with other school systems and periodically visits neighboring towns and cities and seeks the help of the local superintendent in making his list of

successful teachers in various positions which he foresees may become vacant in his own force. I believe that in this way the services of the teachers' agency are less in demand in progressive school systems than formerly.

2. No teachers' agency is probably today in touch with the actual vacancies in any considerable area and in all types of schools. Although the business of any one agency or of all the agencies combined may be greater than hitherto, and this latter surmise is perhaps hardly true, yet on account of the greater self-reliance of principals and superintendents in the choice of teachers, the part which the agency plays is relatively less than formerly.

3. It appears to be true, furthermore, that candidates of good ability and training and particularly teachers of successful experience are daily less inclined to make use of agencies of the commercial type, believing that, while it is not exactly unprofessional to seek such assistance, the chance of appointment and promotion is much more likely to be favorable through other methods of approach.

4. As a result of the facts above indicated, the agency is not likely to be acquainted today under normal conditions with the men and women best qualified for appointment or promotion. With the lessened demand on the agency for assistance by the school superintendents on the one hand and the most efficient candidates on the other, this inadequacy of the agency will in all probability be more emphasized as time passes.

5. The teachers' agency, moreover, which seeks any particular volume of business and to secure this extends its operations over a considerable field can hardly hope to know on the one hand the specific qualifications of the candidates whom it enrolls and on the other hand the particular requirements of any position which has become vacant. In the nature of the case the agency becomes rather in a way less efficient, the larger its undertakings, and in fact today the activity of the agency is for the most part confined to the discovery of vacancies (present, prospective, and sometimes even imaginary!) and to informing candidates of the opening which thus appears. Much less than hitherto is the agency now able to be of any further and specific help to the teachers enrolled in it.

6. The policy of an agency is necessarily to place the candidates

registered with it, even at the hazard of their failure through unsuitable location, and furthermore to use, where possible, personal influence in achieving appointment. This fact is no reflection upon the agency itself, since it is conducted as a business enterprise and is entitled to follow business practice, but the situation represents a serious handicap to the sound administration of public education.

7. It is probably not unfair to say that the agency is always more or less under the temptation of making an "endless chain" by furthering a series of changes, if possible, in connection with every vacancy of which it has knowledge. Obviously, if a position of some importance becomes vacant, an appointment to it may properly involve further changes and promotions within that particular type of work, but there is reason to believe that some agencies systematically encourage as many moves as possible in connection with every appointment. A certain spirit of restlessness is thus developed, primarily in the younger and more inexperienced teachers, who are influenced to change positions from year to year even if there be no social or professional advantage through the change, and even though the increase in salary be practically absorbed by the agency fee.

8. One of the most unfortunate results of the activity of teachers' agencies (although it is not entirely confined to these but sometimes appears in institutional activity in placing candidates) is the tendency to lower salaries by the impression made upon boards of education that a large number of suitable candidates are available in the case of any vacancy. Despite their best efforts, school superintendents are not always able to overcome this impression or to persuade the school trustees that the more capable teacher is well worth the salary demanded.

9. It is true further of some agencies (though certainly not in my experience of any of the more reputable ones) that their business procedure tends to create dissatisfaction, not only among the teachers who are incited to be constantly seeking promotion, but also among supervisory officers who are influenced by various circulars and blanks which they receive to doubt the qualifications of their teaching force. I have seen within the past few weeks circulars and letters from agencies which would have had unfortu-

nate results in various communities had it not been for the intelligence and experience of the superintendents themselves.

10. A fundamental defect of the agency system is that the burden, more particularly the financial burden, of securing appointment and promotion is thereby placed upon the teacher, who can least easily bear it. The income of all the teachers' agencies in the country is an insignificant item in the total cost of public education, but in so far as there is a legitimate charge in connection with the filling of vacancies in the teaching service, the cost ought to fall upon the community rather than upon the individual.

11. The establishment of a code of professional ethics in connection with the appointment and promotion of teachers is to a very considerable extent made difficult if not exactly impossible through the intrusion of the business element into a transaction which ought to be conducted on a professional basis. A well-functioning conscience in this phase of school activity will hardly be developed in the teaching force until the community, the teachers, and certain public officers (boards of education, school superintendents, etc.) are the only persons concerned. Again, this is no reflection upon the teachers' agency, but simply a recognition that the appointment of teachers is in essence a professional and not a business transaction and should be effected therefore in accordance with certain definite and high standards.

It has appeared well to present a statement of the value of a state teachers' agency largely in the negative form of certain restrictions upon the teachers' agency as a commercial or business enterprise. In a way it has been necessary to do this since public experience with the state agency has not been sufficiently long or on a sufficient scale to make it possible to treat the subject adequately from this point of view alone. If, however, a diagnosis of the present situation reveals certain inherent defects and it appears that these defects can be avoided through the establishment of a public agency in connection with the appointment and promotion of teachers, the above considerations become a priori arguments for the wisdom of such action. In all of the points made above, therefore, against the teachers' agency as a commercial proposition there are implicit arguments in favor of a state bureau for this purpose.

Such a bureau offers the following advantages:

a) The expense for this kind of public service will be transferred from the teacher who can ill afford to pay it to the community which is after all most interested in having the service well performed. The teachers' agency should never be established by a state without appropriation sufficient to carry on its work effectively, and no more than a moderate registration fee (and of course no salary percentages) should be asked of the candidates. Obviously if there be reasonable wisdom in public administration, the actual cost of the service will not be greater when performed through a public agency; there will be a saving for the teacher and for the community of the profit which accrues to the commercial teachers' agency through its business activity.

b) The state is proposed as the unit of administration in regard to the appointment and promotion of teachers for evident reasons. The area is not too large for the directors of a teachers' bureau to become fairly acquainted with the different types of communities at least and with the different kinds and grades of school positions. It is even possible within a given state for the official bureau to become cognizant pretty directly of the qualifications of teachers for the more important and responsible positions in the school system. Moreover, with the increasing centralization of school supervision and inspection in the departments of public instruction in the various states and with the appointment of inspectors and commissioners to look after the teaching done throughout the state, there lies the possibility of the most effective co-operation between these inspectors and an official state bureau for appointment and promotion. With commercial agencies these inspectors can in the nature of the case with no propriety co-operate and much, therefore, of their knowledge of conditions and of positions fails to be of use in the interests of the public or of teachers.

c) There is in the theory of a state teachers' agency the assumption (and I believe it to be well borne out by our experience) of entire impartiality in giving the school officials information of promising candidates and to ambitious teachers information of actual and suitable vacancies. In the nature of the case a state agency has only the public interest to serve while other boards or

committees of recommendation are to a greater or less degree influenced by institutional connections, above which limitations every individual or committee concerned will certainly strive to rise but perhaps not always with complete success.

d) A state agency has the additional advantage of easily becoming a clearing-house for all types of teachers and for all kinds of vacancies. In no other bureau, whether of institutional stamp or not, is this similarly true. The university may prepare teachers of a certain number of kinds; the normal school prepares teachers for certain other kinds of work; the technical school here and there may very well train candidates for other types of teaching, but no one of these is in a position to give information or recommendation in regard to all kinds of vacancies which occur in the ordinary system of schools. Certainly the work of boards of recommendation or appointment committees in our various institutions and the knowledge and experience of college presidents and normal-school principals are invaluable for the appointment and promotion of teachers within the commonwealth and on these a state bureau will always greatly rely, but through one central clearing-house of this type superintendents in search of teachers may most easily be directed to the particular institution which can furnish the information or the teacher that is sought.

e) The state teachers' agency represents not merely a convenient unit of administration in the appointment and promotion of teachers, but through the organization of these agencies in the various commonwealths there lies, I believe, the best means for interstate or sectional co-operation that becomes more and more essential in proportion to the importance of the position that is to be filled and to the amount of specialization required of candidates. For some kinds of work the whole country may be scoured without finding more than half a dozen qualified teachers, and the need of the largest co-operation among state agencies in order to locate this kind of ability is therefore perfectly patent. There is in addition, from time to time, in certain sections of the country a dearth of men or women prepared for a given type of teaching, while in other sections there may at the same time be an oversupply of the required talent. Through co-operative state agencies the difficulties of

such a situation will immediately disappear. The promising candidates will be promptly informed of the opportunities that await them in a given section, and the pressing needs of the schools of that area will therefore be promptly met.

I have endeavored to give a conservative and fair review of some disadvantages inherent in the teachers' agency as a business proposition and to suggest some disadvantages which are sometimes incident to its operations. The argument for a public agency is in my opinion amply supported by the criticism of the present situation as well as by the definite benefits which have been suggested as flowing from the assumption of the responsibility by the state itself.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CITY SCHOOL SURVEYS FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

PAUL H. HANUS

Professor of Education, Harvard University

In the following discussion I have had in mind such recent city school surveys as the surveys of Baltimore, Bridgeport, Portland (Oregon), Boise, East Orange, and New York—all of them made by persons actually engaged in school work and by professors of education. I have had in mind, also, the important studies of special features of city school systems made by the Russell Sage Foundation, and similar studies made by public education associations, especially in Philadelphia and New York, and by individuals of recognized standing in the educational world. I have not had in mind city school surveys attempted by bureaus of municipal research because a study of their methods and results reveals little that is significant for members of this society.

With rare exceptions, school surveys attempted by non-professional persons are not likely much longer to interest the lay public or the professional public. The field of education, like other fields of specialized technical activity, is rapidly developing trained men, whose technical resources can compel the respect and win the confidence of laymen and educators alike. Both the lay and the professional public are more and more demanding such resources on the part of those intrusted with the direction and oversight of educational activities and with the solution of educational problems. Indeed, in some quarters, they already insist on employing only persons possessing such resources to carry on educational activities; and it is a natural consequence of this rapidly growing demand that persons without technical training and experience will not interest those who desire to secure a professionally profitable school survey. Moreover, it is clear that amateurs, especially when working under the direction of persons without training and

experience in the field of education, cannot command the resources required for a school survey.

The significance of city school surveys for college and university departments of education becomes apparent when we consider the nature of such surveys. Accordingly, this paper consists chiefly of an attempt to set forth as briefly as a fairly comprehensive statement permits, the aims, scope, spirit, and methods of school surveys.

DEFINITION

A school survey is a study of any or all the aspects of a school system, i.e., of its financial resources; of its aims; of the means and methods it employs; and of the results it achieves. (Although this discussion pertains specifically to surveys of school systems, much of it applies equally to a survey limited to a single school.) A school survey is a regular duty of the resident supervisory staff; and its results should be embodied in the annual report of the superintendent to the board of education, and by the board made accessible to the community. From time to time such a survey may be advantageously committed to non-resident specialists on the initiative of the board or of the community through the board, or on the initiative of the supervisory staff with the approval of the board.

An occasional survey by outsiders is advantageous because no school system is sufficient unto itself. Every good school system seeks to become better, and welcomes suggestions for improvement. And every school system, whether good, bad, or indifferent, often has to contend against unsatisfactory conditions which it is powerless to change, or which will not change without an impetus from without; usually either because these conditions are not recognized by the board or by the staff or both; or if recognized are not seen to spring from removable causes; sometimes because the board, or the staff, or both are, in part, at least indifferent, or inefficient.

PURPOSE

In any case the purpose of a school survey is constructive criticism. Hence it does not ignore the merits of the school system; but it is concerned chiefly with such defects as it is able to

point out, and with the means and methods of removing or minimizing them.

SPIRIT

The spirit of a school survey should be co-operative; i.e., it should enlist the co-operation of the board, the resident staff of officers, and teachers in getting and verifying information, formulating and confirming conclusions, and suggesting remedies. Such co-operation is needed to secure the information sought; moreover, it promotes the active interest of the board and the resident staff in the survey; and lays the foundation for a progressive adoption of the conclusions arrived at and the improvements suggested by the survey.

METHODS

The methods of a school survey should be statistical, inspectorial (personal inspection by the specialists engaged for the survey), and scientific or experimental, so far as reliable scientific or experimental methods are available in education, and can be employed under the conditions governing the survey.

Accordingly, a school survey may cover a study of any or all of the following aspects of a school system:

1. The purposes for which the school system exists—its aims.
2. The financial resources of the school system.
3. The business and the educational organization and administration of the school system.
4. The different kinds of schools; supervision; courses of study; textbooks and reference books; and the teaching; and important incidental or collateral activities such as medical inspection and its related work.
5. The school sites and the buildings, together with their equipment and arrangements for the management, health, and comfort as well as for the instruction of the pupils, such as playgrounds, school gardens, furniture, gymnasiums, libraries, laboratories, workshops, kitchens.
6. What is called "The Wider Use of the School Plant."

Hence a school survey is broader than the scientific measurement of educational results. It must utilize all the methods of

educational investigation. Scientific measurement of educational results aims to modify, confirm, or refute educational opinion by applying objective standards to such procedure and results. Unfortunately, very few such standards are as yet available, but some promising methods—statistical and experimental—for working out such standards are already available, and others are developing. A school survey should utilize such objective standards as we now have, so far as possible, to estimate the merits and defects of the school system under review; and should employ research methods for working out other standards, so far, at least, as to illustrate their significance and value. But, in the present state of the science of education, a school survey must depend largely, if not chiefly, on professional opinion, i.e., on the scholarship, training, and experience of the specialists engaged on the survey—for most of the judgments on the school system studied. Such opinion is, of course, subject to the adverse judgment of those who are responsible for the existing conditions within the school system. But if the survey is committed only to persons of acknowledged professional standing, their professional opinions cannot be lightly set aside; and they will certainly stimulate self-criticism, with all its benefits, on the part of those who are responsible for the school system as it is.

ANY PARTICULAR SURVEY

Bearing in mind the nature, purpose, scope, spirit, and methods of school surveys, any particular survey should be conducted on the following principles:

1. The survey should be limited to what it is reasonable to expect can be accomplished by the staff of specialists available, and within the time limits to which the survey is restricted.

2. The school survey should be intrusted only to persons whose professional standing constitutes a guaranty of disinterested service; and whose equipment of scholarship, technical knowledge, insight, and experience justify the expectation that they will be competent investigators. This staff of specialists for carrying on the survey should have a chief who is ultimately responsible for the plan, methods, and results of the survey. So far as possible,

the entire staff should be on the ground continuously while the survey is in progress. The staff should be nominated by the specialist in charge (the chief), and these nominations should constitute appointments unless vetoed for good reasons by the authorities officially responsible for the survey. The plan of the survey should be outlined by the chief with the approval of his associates. He should assign the members of his staff to their several duties, with due regard to their special fitness for the work assigned to each of them. The specialist in charge should devote a large part of his time, in addition to planning and directing the survey as a whole, to the plans of his associates; and to continuous and detailed criticism of the plans, methods, and reports of his associates as the work goes on. He should further conduct frequent staff conferences for the same purpose.

3. The results of the survey should be embodied in an adequate report, which, in general, might consist of two parts: Part I, to be prepared by the specialist in charge of the survey, and to consist of an appropriate brief descriptive statement of the conditions under which the inquiry was undertaken and carried on, and a concise but comprehensive summary and interpretation of all the work done, including the principal findings and recommendations arrived at by the survey; and Part II to consist of the series of monographs or reports of the associated specialists, on which the generalizations of Part I are based. While they are engaged on the survey, no publicity should be given to the work of any of the specialists; and no portion of the report should be published until the work and report are finished. If the report is published, the printing of the report should be directed entirely by the staff of specialists; and, without the approval of the specialist in charge, no one outside the staff should have access to the report in manuscript or proof until the entire report comes from the press as a finished product.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY THE SURVEY

On the basis of the foregoing principles the survey should endeavor to obtain as satisfactory answers as possible to any or all of the following questions:

1. What are the community's educational needs?
2. Does the school system reveal a clear conception of the educational needs of the community, i.e., of the purpose for which the school system exists—of its aims—on the part of all concerned with its work; i.e., on the part of (a) the board, (b) the staff?
3. What schools, classes, and collateral activities does the community provide, i.e., what instruction does the community offer; and is this offering commensurate with the educational needs of the community in respect to scope; quality; flexibility (adjustment to sectional and individual needs); continuity and intensiveness; articulation, and co-ordination?
4. Is there actual differentiation in practice between the functions of the board of education and those of its staff, i.e., is there centralization of authority and responsibility for effective lay control in the board, and for business and professional management in the board's staff of employees?
5. Is the superintendent of schools the general manager and executive for the whole enterprise, i.e., is the superintendent's authority commensurate with his responsibility?
6. Does the technical administration and supervision show professional insight and leadership within and without the school system? Does it actively encourage and promote the professional growth and practical efficiency of the teaching force?
7. Is the admission of competent and otherwise satisfactory new members of the teaching force properly safeguarded? Is the tenure and promotion of the teaching force based on professional growth and efficiency?
8. What is the cost of the general administration of the school system; of the different kinds of schools; and of other activities carried on by the school system? Why is this expenditure what it is?
9. What are the financial resources of the school system, and how are they secured? Are they adequate, and under the complete control of the board of education?
10. Do initiative and co-operation under leadership, or does passive or restive conformity to instructions from above, prevail throughout the school system?

11. Is there satisfactory provision for disinterested and adequate appraisal of the results achieved by the school system, including statistical studies and experimental tests—scientific measurement of the educational and financial needs of the school system, and of the results it achieves?

12. Is there complete accountability of the board of education to the people for the work done and the money expended under its direction, i.e., is there (a) a system of clear, adequate, incontestable, and accessible records of the educational results progressively achieved (furnished by the staff, with the approval of the board) for the information of the staff, the board, and the people; and (b) a similar system of records covering the business affairs and financial accounts, for the same purpose?

From the foregoing, it appears that school surveys should lay the foundation for progressive efficiency in the school system; or, if that foundation is already laid, should confirm and strengthen it. They can do this by showing the efficacy of ascertaining and facing the facts relative to all the activities of the system; and, incidentally, they should make clear the necessity of perennial investigation of the system by the resident staff of supervisory officers and teachers under the leadership of the superintendent.

SIGNIFICANCE FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

From the foregoing, it is clear that school surveys have profound and far-reaching significance for college and university departments of education. This significance may be formulated briefly as follows:

1. Departments of education may learn much from school surveys either by engaging in them when invited to do so, or by studying the results of such surveys when made by others. In either case the survey familiarizes departments of education with the concrete problems that must be solved in carrying on city school systems. Such surveys, therefore, tend to vitalize the instruction given by departments of education by making it center in actual rather than theoretical problems and conditions—they provide the concrete materials for judging the worth of the aims,

means, methods, and results of the activities of schools and school systems.

2. Such surveys stimulate the development of improved methods of studying educational procedure in city school systems—from the individual classroom to the board of education.

In a word, school surveys may quicken the insight and extend the professional horizon of college teachers of education. They thus help college and university departments of education—both teachers and students—to arrive at a just appraisal of contemporary educational endeavor; and they stimulate researches for the objective confirmation or refutation of educational opinion within and without the teaching profession. These two things—the ability to appraise justly contemporary educational practice and to carry on researches that progressively place the great work of education on a secure professional basis—constitute the foundation of progressive educational efficiency.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF STATE SCHOOL INQUIRIES FOR COLLEGE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

M. B. HILLEGAS

Assistant Professor of Elementary Education, Columbia University

The sincerity of the motives that start and control a state school inquiry determines whether the college department of education may profitably co-operate. No educational institution can afford to enter into partnership with those who for personal or political ends seek to exploit the school system. When, on the other hand, there is an honest purpose to improve the schools by submitting the system as a whole and each element in it to a most careful analysis, the opportunity to participate brings with it peculiar obligations and rewards.

At present, college instructors in education are as a class best qualified for the work connected with an educational inquiry. The special problems involved in the task are of such recent origin that their solution can best be intrusted to those who possess the greatest knowledge of the particular field concerned and who also are skilled in the use of scientific methods. These are the very qualifications that colleges and universities demand of their instructors.

By participating in an educational inquiry the college departments of education are prepared to become the most efficient agents in the improvement of the school system. The college instructor of education holds a position of advantage over all others who may be employed in this work. The existence of more thoroughly organized departments of education in colleges and universities together with the tendency on the part of the states to require better trained officers of instruction and administration result in bringing to colleges an increasing number of those who are and will be most vitally concerned with the improvement of the schools. With this class, no number of printed reports can take the place of an instructor who has become keenly conscious of the educational

needs of the state. His instruction is certain to reflect his first-hand contact with the schools. It follows from this that wherever it is proper the field work should be done by members of the state university or local college faculty of education.

The benefits that college departments may receive from rendering assistance to educational inquiries are by no means limited to those derived from direct participation in the field work. Those who conduct such inquiries experience many limitations, most of which are connected with such fundamental features of education that college instructors can do nothing that will be of greater benefit to themselves and to their students than to seriously undertake the solution of the problems involved. Moreover, only those who have knowledge and facilities equivalent to those possessed by college instructors can contribute in these matters. A brief enumeration of some of the more important difficulties encountered in a state educational inquiry will serve to make clear the possibilities that this type of work offers.

The most conspicuous limitation in conducting a state-wide inquiry is the lack of a usable statement of the aim or purpose of education. The student of education can quote a number of philosophical, sociological, and psychological definitions of aims. If it be granted that any of these are accepted, the difficulty still remains that they are in such broad theoretical terms that they cannot be used in measuring the efficiency of the schools. At the very beginning of an inquiry it is necessary to decide upon some aim for the school system. Unless this is done, there can be no basis for the selection of the essential facts. Only two courses are now possible. One is to assume an aim and to collect and report facts in accordance with it, yet at no point to state the aim or aims that have been employed. The other way is to state clearly what aims are employed and then to organize the facts in accordance. Both methods have defects. The first is inconsistent, for while professing to give all it does give only selected facts. The second method is likely to raise a controversy regarding the validity of the aims employed. It must be conceded that as far as school officers are able to control the situation, the most of them are endeavoring to accomplish what they consider to be the aim of education, and

they may reasonably challenge any interpretation of aim other than their own, especially when they are backed by conventional practice. These difficulties will exist until the various conceptions of aims are unified, interpreted, and clearly expressed in the light of actual educational practice.

A second difficulty is the lack of definite qualitative standards for measuring and describing achievement in the various subjects of instruction. Educational literature is filled with opinions and theories, but comparatively few of the big problems connected with instruction that face the workers in an educational inquiry are settled. Any statement that reflects upon the quality of instruction is almost certain to bring upon its maker the charge of incompetency or something worse. If on the other hand the schools are praised, the public is likely to become suspicious that there is an attempt at "whitewashing," and, therefore, greatly to discount all that does not conform to their own notions. When those who are conducting an inquiry desire to make constructive criticisms they must usually do so in very general terms, because they have few means for definition. The responsibility for deriving such standards rests almost wholly with the colleges. The highly specialized work involved and the absence of financial reward make it unreasonable to expect those to undertake it who cannot at once make it a profitable part of their regular duties.

A third difficulty is the lack of standards that will measure and describe many of the quantitative factors in educational administration. These standards are largely dependent upon those that will measure the quality of school work. A single example will serve to illustrate the close relationship that exists between the two. Every state school inquiry must consider the question of the consolidation of rural schools. There has been an assumption that small classes are not efficient and for this reason people are often urged to give up their schools and transport children to larger ones. There is, however no conclusive evidence regarding the most efficient size of class, and there can be no definite conclusion in this matter until it is possible to measure the quality of achievement in classes of different sizes. Relative position is commonly used for measuring certain factors in the educational system without

reference to the qualitative side. This method serves well for some purposes, but it is seldom useful in a state inquiry and it may often be harmful.

A fourth difficulty is the inadequacy of school records. At regular intervals the states and many of the local units publish elaborate school reports. When these are examined for the purposes of a school inquiry they are usually found woefully incomplete and inaccurate. The control of the business affairs of the schools has usually been sincere but most unbusinesslike. It is seldom possible to determine what the different departments of the system cost. Until recently, there have been very few attempts at keeping reliable pupil records. Even now it is impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy many of the fundamental features of attendance. Much has been done that would serve to improve reports, but the influence of these efforts has not generally reached the schools. Often the officers do not understand the significance of the data at their command, and as a consequence they require their teachers to record and report facts indiscriminately. In this way the energies of the teachers are wasted and the gathering of statistics becomes a direct hindrance to efficient instruction. Those who are accountable for school reports and records require definite training in order that they may do the work in the most economical manner. College departments of education have in this matter a very great opportunity and also a direct responsibility.

The character of state school inquiries is certain to change. It has often seemed advisable to have the work done by those who were presumably impartial. It cannot be denied, however, that much of that which has been attempted by outsiders could have been much more effectively done by the school officers within the state. These individuals are usually conscious of defects that no outsider can detect in the brief time allowed for an inquiry. When the method of conducting an inquiry has become well defined, it is reasonable to expect that the regular school officials will do practically all that is now undertaken in inquiries.

The greatest significance that a state educational inquiry can have for college departments of education is the motive that it furnishes for direct participation in the improvement of instruction.

School officials and the public generally are now convinced—possibly too thoroughly convinced—that the public schools are very faulty. The problem of how to improve them is paramount. There is so much at stake, however, that it is unwise to begin any large experiments in the public schools. Superintendents, as well as the public which supports the schools, demand first of all to know where they may observe the proposed changes in actual operation. The colleges have been advancing many theories and finding it easy to criticize. Both school officials and college instructors have been looking to the schools to solve somehow the problems involved. College graduates are entering the field equipped with a thorough knowledge of what are supposed to be the best educational practices, but they have received little training that prepares them to deal intelligently with the actual improvement of instruction. The colleges with all their facilities must concern themselves more directly with the improvement of instruction. This demands that instructors, in place of telling how to teach, actually identify themselves with the teaching.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECENT SCHOOL SURVEYS

G. D. STRAYER AND I. L. KANDEL
Columbia University

AND

CARTER ALEXANDER
George Peabody College for Teachers

NOTE.—This bibliography is printed for the benefit of members who may wish to undertake school surveys in connection with their own institutions.

I. CITY SURVEYS

ATLANTA, GA.

Report of Survey of the Department of Education, 1912.

An educational survey conducted by the Bureau of Municipal Research (New York) at the request of the local chamber of commerce.

Scope: I, Evidences of Progress; II, Weaknesses in Administration, dealing mainly with unsanitary toilets, with some reference to defects of school equipment, fire risks, and use of playgrounds; III, Defects in Administrative Records and Need for Publicity; IV, Constructive Suggestions arising immediately out of II.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Report of the Commission Appointed to Study the System of Education in the Public Schools of Baltimore, U.S. Bur. Ed. Bul. No. 4, 1911.

The commission was appointed by the Baltimore school board to make a study of the curriculum and methods of instruction in the schools, particularly as compared with work in other cities.

Method: The history of the school system was reviewed from published records and personal interviews. Recent and current criticisms were reviewed, and written expressions of opinion were invited through an official circular and the public press. Actual work in the schools was observed in schools in each of the 22 groups of the city, half the schools of the system being thus visited. "Our first reliance for the interpretation of the materials so collected has been a comparison with other cities," some of which were visited personally. Published reports and regulations, courses of study, etc., were studied and special inquiries made. For purposes of comparison, prevailing conditions and tendencies since the beginning of the century were considered. Judgments were not only based on this material, but opinions were also "based upon general conceptions of educational excellence," the personal element being so far as possible eliminated by recommending "in the main, only those practices which have been proved by experience," and by setting forth general principles and ideals of education with unanimity.

Scope: History and present conditions; criticism and suggestions on topics concerned mainly with the supervision of schools, the training and efficiency of the teaching force, the curriculum for elementary schools, and questions arising immediately out of these. The school plant, attendance, health, control, and discipline of pupils were given minor treatment.

BOISE, IDAHO

Report of C. N. Kendall, Commissioner of Education of New Jersey, on the Boise Public Schools, submitted to the Board of Education, December 15, 1910.

An inquiry of one week conducted by Commissioner Kendall at the request of the local board.

Method: Personal inspection.

Scope: Brief treatment of schools, buildings, and equipment of playgrounds; the importance of retaining teachers in the system and the consequent need of raising salaries; desirability of introducing more manual training, physical training, games and plays, medical inspection, and ungraded classes.

BOISE, IDAHO

Expert Survey of Public School System, 1913.

Conducted by Professors E. C. Elliott, C. H. Judd, and G. D. Strayer, at request of local board.

Method: Used local administrative records, conferred with school officials and teachers, and made personal visitations to schools and classes.

Scope: Covers strength and general influence of the course of study, supervision, classification and retention of children, expenditures, and co-operation of schools with community. A special report on instruction in the schools and a summary are appended.

BOSTON, MASS.

Report on the Boston School System, 1911.

Conducted by the Finance Commission at the invitation of the mayor, to determine justification for proposed increases in school expenditures.

Method: They tried "to see what the schools are doing and how they are trying to do it."

Scope: One of the most comprehensive of educational commission reports. Although primarily interested in the financial administration of the system, the inquiry goes into every phase of the educational system. This is preliminary to a review of financial conditions and needs of different branches of the service. A comparison of the cost of education by items in different cities is made. The conclusions and recommendations deal with the possible increases of expenditures desirable to raise the efficiency of the schools.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Report of the Examination of the School System, Conducted by James H. Van Sickle, 1913.

Method: The investigation which was conducted for a special committee is unique in that it is the only one so far conducted by public-school men. Nearly

all of those working on the investigation were public-school men. The report is especially good for the sanity, directness, and simplicity of its recommendations and for graphical presentations of facts.

Scope: Aside from the usual matters of organization and finances, the report deals specifically with the city normal school, the high school, industrial conditions in the city, history work throughout the schools, and arithmetic and English work in the grades.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, 1897.

The commission of nine members was appointed by the mayor to represent the city council, the board of education, and outside members, and was "to utilize all that is good in the present system, to discard all that is defective, and to apply new methods where needed."

Method: Use of circular letters of inquiry, aid of experts and prominent educators from other cities, and active co-operation of all officials in the Chicago school system.

Scope: The report, probably the earliest of its kind, is a comprehensive study of all phases of the educational organization and some of the administrative problems of a large city system. In many respects no better presentation of educational opinion on these matters has ever been made.

CLEVELAND, OHIO

Report of the Educational Commission Appointed by the Board of Education to Examine into the Government, Supervision, and Course of Study of the Cleveland Public Schools, 1906.

Consisted of business and professional men.

Method: The usual ones of visitation, study, and discussion.

Scope: Deals comprehensively with all phases of the school question. Special topics are a better adaptation of elementary-school work for breadwinners, and advocacy of wider use of the school plant.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.

Report of the Examination of the School System of East Orange, N.J., 1912.

A board committee called in "a disinterested person not in any way connected with the school system . . . to make the examination in any way he deemed best and to prepare his report without consultation with the committee." Professor E. C. Moore was chosen for this report.

Method: In addition to the usual methods, careful study was made of the actual work of the schools, including examinations in elementary-school subjects. The high school was given particular attention on the theory that any shortcomings of the system would be clearly apparent during the strain of transition from the grades to high school.

Scope: An attempt to measure the efficiency of the entire school system.

GREENWICH, CONN.

The Book of the Educational Exhibit of Greenwich, Conn., 1912.

Conducted by the Russell Sage Foundation. "The object of the exhibit and of this booklet is to show parents and taxpayers Greenwich school conditions as they are, illustrate conditions as they ought to be, and suggest ways in which school conditions may be changed from what they are to what they ought to be."

Method and scope: The book reproduces a few of the photographs and diagrams presented as features of the educational exhibit, dealing mainly with the school plant and its wider use, measurements of school efficiency in Greenwich, expenditures, and open-air schools.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

A survey of instruction in grammar in the elementary school is now under way.

MONTCLAIR, N.J.

Report on the Programme of Studies in the Public Schools of Montclair, N.J., 1911.

A report of an investigation conducted by Professor Paul H. Hanus at the request of the Board of Education of Montclair.

Method: Study of the program of studies and visits of inspection to the schools.

Scope: After a general survey of the schools, buildings, and equipment, the report deals generally with the status of the teachers, the quality of the teaching, and the program of studies in elementary and high schools. In connection with the latter, tables showing retardation, average ages, distribution, reasons for leaving school, and nationality are presented to answer the question whether the program adequately meets the educational needs of the pupils. Suggestions are offered for a revision of the program, in both the elementary and high schools.

Report Showing Comparative Cost of Public Schools at Montclair and East Orange, 1911.

An investigation undertaken by a certified public accountant at the request of the Committee on Cost Efficiency of the Board of Education, Montclair, N.J., "to show where the money [educational expenditure] goes and what return comes to us from our expenditure."

Method: The statistics were "compiled from published data and consultations with school officials."

Scope: The report covers all branches of expenditures coming within the scope of educational administration—salaries of officials engaged in teaching and administration, the cost of school buildings, supplies, equipment, and different types of schools and new subjects. The per capita cost of the number of pupils per teacher is given on the basis of average enrolment and average attendance.

NEW YORK

Report of the Committee on School Inquiry Appointed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, 1912.

By resolution of the New York City Board of Estimate and Apportionment passed on October 26, 1910, a committee was appointed "to conduct an inquiry into the organization, equipment, and method, both financial and educational, of the Department of Education, including such plans and proposals as may have been formulated or may be under consideration by the Board of Education for extending and developing its educational activities, and that for this purpose the committee be authorized to associate with it such experts within and without the government of the city of New York as may assist it in the conduct of this inquiry and in the formulation of recommendations of this Board."

Eleven specialists were engaged on the inquiry under the general direction of Professor Hanus. Other investigators were also appointed to deal more specifically with the physical plant and business system of the Board of Education.

The full report is very voluminous, but abstracts have been prepared by the Bureau of Municipal Research and the Public Education Society of New York City. Several parts have also been republished by the World Book Co., of Yonkers, N.Y.

Method: "The method of inquiry has been statistical, inspectorial (personal inspection by members of the staff), comparative (comparison of New York City's schools and school system with those of other cities), and experimental, so far as reliable experimental or scientific methods are available in education and could be employed; and we have made much use of conferences with officials and members of the teaching and supervisory staff. . . . We have been particularly careful not to make statements unsupported by facts where facts are needed; and we consistently objected, in spite of considerable pressure from without during the first months of the inquiry, to issue statements of findings, because we had not yet done all we could to assure ourselves of their validity. . . . Our method also aimed at the co-operation of the Board of Education and of the supervisory and teaching forces in getting facts and in reaching and verifying conclusions."

Scope: The complete report may be divided into four main groups: I, General; II, Elementary Schools; III, High Schools; IV, Buildings. The first group deals with questions affecting the general administration of the school system, organization of the Board of Education, use of the school plant, office routine, supervision, and the Board of Examiners. Group two is devoted to various aspects of elementary-school administration and classroom instruction, such as promotion and part time, retardation, attendance, course of study and supervision, classroom instruction, intermediate schools, and ungraded classes. In the third group the high schools and their problems—organization and administration, courses of study, commercial and vocational education—are considered. The subjects of the fourth group are the conditions and efficiency and construction of school buildings, and atmospheric conditions in the schools. A separate section contains the Introduction and Conclusions of the reports as a whole.

PORTLAND, ORE.

Report of the Survey of the Public School System, November, 1913.

Conducted under direction of E. P. Cubberley for a committee appointed at a meeting of taxpayers in 1912. There was an appropriation of \$7,500 for the survey which was undertaken only on condition that the findings were to be published exactly as reported.

Method: Short personal visitations and extended study of records and documents on the grounds of great uniformity throughout the system.

Scope: A very complete treatment of all matters of importance grouped under: I, Organization, and Administration; II, Instructional Needs; III, Buildings and Health; IV, Attendance, Records, Costs; Appendix A, A Suggested New Law for the Management of the Portland District.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

See Waterbury, Conn.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

Report of Investigations for the Associated Charities of Syracuse, N.Y., Made by the Training School for Public Service, Conducted by the Bureau of Municipal Research, New York City, 1912.

Two reports, (1) on the Syracuse Public Schools, by Dr. Horace L. Brittain, and (2) on the Syracuse Board of Health, by Dr. A. E. Shiplet, were made.

The report is in the form of an itemized list under two main heads: I, significant facts disclosed by the school survey—dealing with needed improvements in sanitation of schoolhouses, playgrounds, records, salaries, the school, and the community; II, constructive suggestions for remedying the defects noted.

WATERBURY, CONN.

Help Your School Surveys, Bureau of Municipal Research.

A combined report dealing with the public schools of Waterbury and with classroom instruction in St. Paul, Minn.

The report follows the usual plan of the Bureau of Municipal Research surveys. The conditions favorable to efficiency are first considered and include questions of administration, sanitation, textbooks, and courses of study, and co-operation between school and community. The defective conditions and their possible improvement and correction are then pointed out. In dealing with class instruction the survey details the number of classes visited and the subjects of instruction heard.

The Waterbury investigation was undertaken as a three days' survey at the request of a committee of business men as part of an investigation of the organization and business procedure of all city departments by Dr. Horace L. Brittain. Visits were made to eighteen schools, including one high school. He also made "a study of educational records and reports in offices of principals and superintendent, of routine procedure in offices of inspector of buildings and superintendent, etc."

The St. Paul investigation was undertaken as a six days' survey. It deals only with classroom instruction as investigated by A. W. Farmer.

II. STATE AND COUNTY SURVEYS

CONNECTICUT

Report of Education Commission, in Report of the Board of Education of the State of Connecticut, 1909.

The Education Commission was appointed by the State Joint Committee on Education under a Senate resolution of July 31, 1907, "to inquire into the condition and progress of common-school education in this state and make to the next General Assembly a report containing its findings and recommendations."

Method: Public meetings were held in different parts of the state; the school laws of Connecticut and other states were examined; reports of superintendents in the state were considered; schools were visited; and consultations were held with persons interested in educational matters.

Scope: The report deals with the inequalities of school opportunities, and school efficiency throughout the state, and their causes—local management, poor teaching, unsanitary school buildings, and bad equipment; and makes recommendations for the improvement of these things by more centralization, higher salaries for teachers, stricter enforcement of compulsory attendance, better school buildings, state high schools, and industrial education.

ILLINOIS

Report of the Illinois Educational Commission to the 46th General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Authorized by Act of the General Assembly, Approved May 25, 1907.

Method: A thorough investigation by the secretary of the commission of school laws and school systems in other states; the revision, condensation, simplification, and codification of the Illinois school laws; material gathered from reports of state superintendents of public instruction, U.S. government bulletins, N.E.A. reports, etc. The result of the investigation and recommendations of the commission were embodied in bulletins issued by the commission, from time to time.

Scope: Description of the subject-matter of the bulletins issued by the commission; recommendations of the commission; general review, by states, of legislation *in re* state superintendents, state boards of education, county superintendent, county boards of education, units of school organization, township organization, certification of teachers, county teachers' institutes, salaries of teachers, and chapters on purpose and value of county teachers' institutes, minimum salary legislation, restoration of the two-mill tax, and subjects not thoroughly investigated by the commission.

MARYLAND

An Educational Survey of a Suburban and Rural County—Montgomery County, Maryland, U.S. Bur. Ed. Bulletin No. 32, 1913.

The educational survey was part of a general sociological survey of Montgomery Co., Md., undertaken by the Department of Church and Country Life of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church at the request of the Montgomery Co. Country Life Committee.

Method: The schools were considered objectively with respect to "the material equipment, the teaching force, enrolment and attendance, and all the various activities of each individual school." To discover the attitude of the people toward the schools, questions bearing on different school problems were discussed with individuals, representative men and women, and at public meetings, and a questionnaire was sent around to the heads of families.

Scope: The report deals generally with the prevailing economic, social, and religious conditions of the county and proceeds to a consideration of educational conditions, including schools for white and colored children, the school budget, and private educational institutions. A chapter is devoted to criticism and suggestions of school conditions furnished by the public. The report concludes with a general summary and recommendations on organization and supervision, the course of study, and number of schools.

MASSACHUSETTS

Report of Industrial Commission, 1907.

So well known that extended comment is unnecessary. Has been reprinted by the Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

MICHIGAN

Report of the Bureau of Research of the Upper Peninsula (Michigan) Education Association, 1913.

The investigation was conducted by the Bureau of Research, a department of the Upper Peninsula Education Association, instituted in 1912 and consisting of five members and a permanent secretary. The first task undertaken was "an educational survey of the Upper Peninsula to discover the problems, with a view to solving the problems."

Method: The questionnaire method was employed and reports were received from teachers, superintendents, and commissioners.

Scope: The report contains a survey of conditions affecting both city and rural schools, and treats of such questions as the preparation of teachers, their length of service, the size of classes, equipment and method, subject-matter, manual training, nationalities of pupils, and newer problems. The requirements of high-school graduation are discussed, and general suggestions on the subject as a whole are offered.

MINNESOTA

A commission appointed by the legislature is now at work on a state survey.

NEW YORK, WESTCHESTER COUNTY

Reports in Westchester County. A Study of Local School Conditions, 1912.

An investigation conducted by Professor Alexander J. Inglis at the request of the Westchester County Research Bureau for the purpose of "increasing the efficiency of our immense and costly system of public schools."

Method: The study was made on the basis of an examination of the official needs of the various schools and superintendence districts.

Scope: The report is devoted to a consideration of the existing defects in reporting and recording school and administrative facts, and the elements of efficiency which should be reported, such as attendance, retardation, and elimination, and cost of schools. The suggestions deal with methods of publishing information concerning the schools.

NORTH DAKOTA

Report of the Temporary Educational Commission to the Governor and Legislature of the State of North Dakota, 1912.

A temporary educational commission, not including experts, was appointed by the Senate in 1911 to make a study of educational conditions generally in the United States and elsewhere "with a view to the presentation of a report which will form the basis for the unifying and systematizing of the educational system of the state," and also to prepare a bill embodying its recommendations.

Method: The commission held conferences and issued questionnaires to leading educators in the country, and collected other material and reports. Opportunity was afforded to those who desired to express their views on the educational conditions of the state. The statistical records were not tested by specific examination. The need of expert investigators is, however, recognized and recommended.

Scope: The report describes the main features of the state system of education, and after quoting an expert's statement of what a state system of education should be, it arrives at general principles and conclusions specially applicable to North Dakota. In an appendix are presented the facts, statutes, descriptions, financial statistics, and views of authorities, which form the basis of the report.

OHIO

A commission authorized by the legislature is at work on a survey which is being conducted largely by the Bureau of Municipal Research of New York.

TEXAS

Report by Arthur Lefevre, Secretary of the Organization for Enlargement by the State of Texas of Its Institutions of Higher Learning, on the Organization and Administration of a State's Institutions of Higher Education (with special reference to the state of Texas).

Method: Personal investigation of various institutions and library work.

Scope: Discussion of the necessity of harmonious relations between president and faculty; disorganization arising from transgression of proper functions by governing boards or state legislatures; questions of duplication of work in the higher institutions, and rivalry for state appropriations; inexpediency of a central board, and historical summary of work in states having such board; remedy suggested for defect in Texas system; *in re* central boards for state normal schools; schools for defectives; voluntary co-operation of higher institutions with

secondary institutions urged; suggestions made for apportionment of tax; federal co-operation discussed.

(Only advance sheets were available for this report.)

UNITED STATES

A Comparative Study of Public School Systems in the Forty-eight States, Russell Sage Foundation, Division of Education, 1912.

A pamphlet compiled with the object of making available to legislators, school workers, and others having at heart the interests of public education, salient facts concerning school conditions in all the states, to render available to each state the experience of all. The report is particularly valuable for its graphic presentations of educational facts.

Method: The comparisons were made and diagrams and tables presented mainly on the basis of data published in the Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education for 1911.

Scope: The report, which is presented in the form of tables and diagrams, with running comments, deals with the children of school age, their attendance, and length of school year, their mortality and survival. Tables are given showing the expenditures on education in general and on school plants, and the cost per child. Other questions treated cover legislation in the matter of medical inspection, textbooks, school buildings, the number of illiterates, and teachers' salaries.

VERMONT

The Carnegie Foundation will shortly publish a survey which it undertook at the request of the state authorities.

VIRGINIA

Report of the Virginia Education Commission to the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1912.

The Education Commission of seven members, including "four experienced educators," was appointed by the governor in 1910 under an act of the General Assembly with the duty "after investigation, to devise stable and systematic methods for the maintenance, management, and expansion of these higher educational institutions, according to the needs of each of them, and with reference to a definite and harmonious educational system."

Method: The commission studied each of the institutions forming a part of the state education system; "its recommendations are based on a study of education in this country as found in educational literature, official reports, special reports of institutions and commissions, conference with the heads of institutions themselves, and with others, personal knowledge of facts and conditions, and upon two separate, independent reports (the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning, and the United States Bureau of Education)."

Scope: The report contains a description of the various educational institutions of the states, and inquiries into the scope and function of each branch—more particularly those connected with higher education. The need for co-ordinating the work of these institutions and centralizing effort is emphasized, and recommendations are offered for future progress.

WISCONSIN

Report of the Commission upon the Plans for the Extension of Industrial and Agricultural Training, 1911.

A commission of four professional men was appointed by resolution of the legislature in 1909 to consider the problems and causes of the great amount of illiteracy in the state of Wisconsin and the need for night schools and night trade schools for those who cannot attend day schools, and "to report . . . upon remedies for these conditions."

Method: The only reference to this aspect is the mention of frequent conferences for a year and a half, and the appointment of subcommittees to consider special phases, viz., industrial education and agricultural education.

Scope: The general conditions and educational needs of the state are considered and in view of the recommendations by the Commission of Industrial and Agricultural Education, the provisions in Germany, England, and the United States are presented. On the question of industrial training the problems arising in its administration are discussed, while in connection with agricultural education its value and existing provisions with suggestions for improvement are dealt with.

Preliminary Report of the Committee of Fifteen, 1911.

The committee was appointed in 1911 by the State Superintendent of Education to investigate educational needs and conditions in Wisconsin. The committee divided itself into five groups, committees dealing with consolidation, preparation and qualification of teachers, supervision, social-center movement, and high-school education for country areas.

Method: Conferences and discussion based on the experience of the members of the committee in all types of educational institutions, and the use of statistical data obtained through the state superintendent.

Scope: The report deals in the main with the attitude of the people to the schools and their criticisms and suggestions, and presents the recommendations of the subcommittees.

Preliminary Report on Conditions and Needs of Rural Schools in Wisconsin, 1912.

An investigation conducted by the Wisconsin State Board of Public Affairs and the New York Bureau of Municipal Research working in co-operation. The material is very forcefully presented.

Method: "The findings . . . are based upon a general examination of conditions in 27 counties in widely separated portions of the state, and upon a more detailed investigation of conditions in 131 schools in 13 counties."

Scope: After dealing with the factors which make for progress in rural schools, the report criticizes, item by item, the lax methods of controlling school expenditures, and sanitary and educational conditions of rural schools. In a similar way the defects of county and state supervision are pointed out, and the supervision of state graded and state rural schools are contracted. The report concludes with a list of suggested administrative and legislative remedies.

LIST OF INVESTIGATIONS BY MEMBERS

CARTER ALEXANDER

Professor of School Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers

NOTE.—For each item, the title comes first, then the name of the person to whom correspondence should be addressed, with the name of his institution. The exact address may easily be obtained from the educational directory of the United States Bureau of Education.

The items have been classified roughly but the classifications are not mutually exclusive. However, most items of the same nature will be found close together.

ADMINISTRATION, MISCELLANEOUS

Economy of Time in Education. F. E. Thompson, University of Colorado.

The Accredited System in Relation to Entrance to the Professions. Paul J. Kruse, University of Washington.

Vocational Education in the College. Bessie L. Gambrill, Alfred University.

A Comparative Study of the Internal Government of Selected Universities. Charles H. Johnston, University of Illinois.

The Economic Status of College Graduates. C. E. Noerenberg, Champaign, Ill. University of Illinois.

The Present Status of the Honor System in American Colleges and Universities. Bird T. Baldwin, Swarthmore College.

School Costs and School Accounting. G. D. Strayer, Columbia University.

The Apportionment of School Funds in Illinois Cities. Omar Caswell, Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois.

Elementary Education in Germany. Thomas Alexander, Columbia University.

Commercial Education in Germany (in press). F. E. Farrington, Columbia University.

Technical Education in France. F. E. Farrington, Columbia University.

School Health Administration. L. W. Rapeer, Columbia University.

Physical Growth and School Progress. Bird T. Baldwin, Swarthmore College.

Negro Education in the South. W. S. Sutton, University of Texas.

Rural-School Supervision. Alice Morris, Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois.

The Relation of Mobility of Population to Persistency in School. H. T. McKinney, Gibson City, Ill.

The Size of Classes in Relation to Schoolroom Efficiency. L. D. Coffman, University of Illinois.

The Size of the School Class. G. D. Strayer, Columbia University.

A Study of the Causes and Conditions of Tardiness. W. F. Kennedy, University of Pittsburgh.

Relation of Temperature, Humidity, and Ventilation to Working Capacity and Health. A. Caswell Ellis, University of Texas.

- The Optimum Time Allotment for the Various School Subjects.* G. D. Strayer, Columbia University.
- An Investigation of Home-Study Conditions in Several Virginia Schools.* W. H. Heck, University of Virginia.
- Problems, Methods, and Administration of School Study.* Alfred L. Hallquest, University of Illinois.
- The Principles of State School Administration.* (A formulation, with illustrative laws, legal decisions, and a school code and constitution for a well-organized state. Two vols. nearly ready for publication.) E. C. Elliott, University of Wisconsin, and E. P. Cubberley, Stanford University.
- Proposed Revision of the School Code of California.* E. P. Cubberley, Stanford University.
- State Control of School Buildings* (soon to be published). W. A. Cook, University of Colorado.
- The Expectancy of City School Superintendents.* E. L. Lawson, Villa Grove, Ill. University of Illinois.
- The Causes of Failure of Teachers.* Henry Buellisfield, Nokomis, Ill. University of Illinois.
- Methods and Standards in the Promotion of Teachers.* C. R. Foster, University of Pittsburgh.
- Objective Standards for Determining Teaching Efficiency.* F. C. Clapp, University of Wisconsin.
- The Rating of Teachers.* C. L. Harlan, Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois.
- Annotated Bibliography on Teachers' Salaries.* Walter Mohr, Swarthmore College.
- The Administration of Teachers' Colleges and Schools and Departments of Education.* W. C. Ruediger, George Washington University.
- State Subsidies for Special Educational Activities.* E. C. Elliott, University of Wisconsin.
- Recognition in the United States of College Training in Education for the Purposes of Certifying Teachers.* Raymond W. Sies, University of Pittsburgh.
- A Study of Teachers' Pensions and Pension Schemes.* Raymond W. Sies, University of Pittsburgh.
- A Study of the First Year of Teaching of a Group of Smith College Graduates, 1908-12.* Elizabeth K. Adams, Smith College.

HIGH SCHOOL

- Terminology in the Literature of Secondary Education.* C. H. Johnston, University of Illinois.
- Two Studies of the Scholarship and Progress of Groups of High-School Students.* G. D. Strayer, Columbia University.
- A Statistical Study of the Distribution of Time in the High-School Principal's "School Day."* (200 principals.) Claud L. McCabe, University of Illinois.

- Retardation and Elimination in High Schools.* Principal J. H. Owens, Havre de Grace, Md. Johns Hopkins University.
- State Aid for High Schools.* J. F. Wiley, Mattoon, Ill. University of Illinois.
- The Salaries of High-School Teachers in Texas.* Cora A. Goodwin, University of Texas.
- Pedagogical Training in High Schools.* Francis E. Millar, University of Washington.
- The Organization of Training Departments in Public High Schools for the Preparation of Rural-School Teachers.* George F. James, University of Minnesota.
- An Investigation of Desirable Combinations of Subjects to Be Assigned to Teachers in Small Public High Schools.* George F. James, University of Minnesota.
- How Far Do High-School Teachers Teach Subjects in Which They Specialize?* Cora Goodwin, University of Texas.
- The Value of the Professional Courses in Education as Viewed by Secondary-School Teachers.* Frederick Eby, University of Texas.
- The Relation of the Elective System and Curriculum Differentiation in High Schools.* Charles E. Holley, University of Illinois.
- The Psychology of Vocational Guidance with Special Reference to Life-Career Study in the High School.* Charles L. Jacobs, High School, San Jose, Cal. Stanford University.
- Classification and Statistical Study of High-School Students' Mistakes in English Composition.* Elizabeth Anthony, University of Illinois.
- Imagery Appeals and Their Employment in the Teaching of English Literature in High Schools.* Ruth G. Bagley, University of Illinois.
- Tests of High-School Pupils.* E. S. Roe, Victor, Colo. University of Colorado.
- Assignments to High-School Pupils.* B. E. Schwering, Cheyenne, Wyo. University of Colorado.
- Organizations for Rural Adolescents.* A. Caswell Ellis, University of Texas.
- Social Activities of the High School.* F. H. Swift, University of Minnesota.

HISTORY OF EDUCATION

- Sources of Hebrew Education.* Paul E. Kretzmann, University of Minnesota.
- History of the Education of Atypical Children.* F. J. Keller, New York University.
- Educational Reorganization in the Light of History.* F. F. Bunker, New York University.
- History of Religious Education.* H. H. Meyer, New York University.
- History of Religious Education in the United States.* L. A. Williams, University of North Carolina.
- History of School Discipline.* K. L. Thompson, New York University.
- Decline of Denominational Religious Control in American Colleges.* H. H. Holmes, Columbia University.
- Relation between the Development of Free Schools and Charity Education in the American Commonwealth during the Early Nineteenth Century.* A. R. Mead, Columbia University.

- The Attitude toward the Child in Educational History.* Cora A. Ossire, George Washington University.
- Historical Survey of the Theory and Practice of Industrial Education since the Renaissance.* L. F. Anderson, University of Illinois.
- Development of Technological Education in America.* H. O. Rugg, Urbana, Ill. University of Illinois.
- History of the Realschul Movement in Germany.* William Dietel, University of Texas.
- History of Vocational Education.* William J. McGrath, New York University.
- Historic Faith in Education.* H. H. Horne, New York University.
- History of the Education of Woman.* Miss M. E. Lacey, New York University.
- A Survey of the Origin and Development of Teachers' Institutes.* Omar Caswell, University of Illinois.
- History of the Academies and Seminaries of the State of Indiana prior to 1850.* John Hardin Thomas, Indiana University.
- Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New York.* R. F. Seybolt, Columbia University.
- Founding of a State System of Free Schools in Ohio.* W. E. Sealock, Columbia University.
- The Progress of Education in Texas since 1883.* W. S. Sutton, University of Texas.
- The School-Land Movement in Texas.* J. L. Jackson, University of Texas.
- Education in the Parishes of Colonial Virginia.* Guy F. Wells, Columbia University.
- The Educational Views of Daniel Defoe.* E. R. Spencer, University of Illinois.
- The Life and Educational Work of Henry Sabin.* F. E. Bolton, University of Washington.

MEASUREMENTS AND TESTS, GENERAL

- Psychological Tests as College-Entrance Examinations.* Eleanor Harris Rowland, Reed College.
- Standardization of Mental Tests of Adults.* W. V. Bingham, Dartmouth College.
- Organization of Tests of Intelligence.* Lewis R. Hoover, Indiana University.
- Measuring Efficiency of Elementary-School Graduates in Community Life.* J. L. Meriam, University of Missouri.
- Variability in Test-Marking in Minnesota High Schools.* A. W. Rankin, University of Minnesota.
- Mental Tests of Adolescents and Adults.* Miss Keller, Park School, Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University.
- Fatigue Tests in a San Jose Evening School.* R. W. Bridgman, Stanford University.
- The Relation of Spelling Ability to General Intelligence and to Meaning Vocabulary.* J. D. Houser, Alameda, Cal. Stanford University.

- Intellectual Tests in Relation to the Analysis of Intelligence.* L. M. Terman, Stanford University.
- Correlations of Mental Abilities.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Distribution of Learning.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Scale for Measuring Learning Ability.* V. A. C. Henmon, University of Wisconsin.
- The Validity of School Examinations.* F. J. Kelley, Columbia University.
- Reliability of Individual and Group Tests.* H. W. Chase, University of North Carolina.
- Experimental Investigation of Pupils' Intelligence.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Mental Tests on College Freshmen and Seniors in an Industrial School.* Joel B. Thomas, Swarthmore College.
- Tests of Seven Hundred and Fifty Freshmen with Nine Mental Tests.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Binet Tests for Juvenile Delinquents.* W. E. Talbert, Stanford University.
- The Accuracy and Sufficiency of the Binet-Simon Tests.* M. V. O'Shea, University of Wisconsin.
- A Comparative Study of the Revisions of the Binet Tests.* L. M. Terman, Stanford University.
- Investigation of the Binet-Simon Tests in a Public School of New York City.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Binet and Other Tests with High-School Pupils.* L. M. Terman, Stanford University.
- Binet Tests Compared with the Tests Used in Indiana University Clinic for Defectives.* Miss Moe C. Trevillian, Indiana University.

MEASUREMENTS AND TESTS, SPECIAL

- Scale for Measuring Ability in Algebra.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Scale for Measuring Ability in Arithmetic.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Survey of a City School System with the Courtis Tests.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- An Extension of Otis and Davidson's Investigation of the Courtis Tests to Other Grades than the Eighth.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Abilities of Elementary Pupils in Addition.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- The Efficiency of Grammar-Grade Pupils in Reasoning Tests in Arithmetic at Different Periods of the School Day in Roanoke, Va.* W. H. Heck, University of Virginia.
- Scale for Measuring Drawings.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Experimental-Critical Investigation of Drawing Ability in Public-School Children.* James E. Lough, New York University.

- Handwriting Norms in the State of Missouri.* W. W. Charters, University of Missouri.
- Studies of Pressure in the Handwriting of School Children.* C. Truman Gray, University of Texas.
- Test of a Standard Scale in Handwriting.* Earl W. Reed, University of Pittsburgh.
- A Study of Vocabulary Tests.* L. M. Terman, Stanford University.
- A Scale for the Evaluation of Oral Reading.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Scale for Measuring Ability to Read.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Standard Tests in Grammar.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Scales for Measuring English Composition.* F. W. Ballou, Harvard University.
- Measuring Progress in Learning Latin.* Paul H. Hanus, Harvard University.
- Scales for Measuring Progress in Translation in German, French, and Latin.* Paul H. Hanus, Harvard University.
- Measurement of Progress in Foreign Languages.* V. A. C. Henmon, University of Wisconsin.
- Measurement of Abilities in Geometry.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Measurement of Abilities in United States History.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- Scale for Measuring Ability in History.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Scale for Measuring Ability in Physics.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- Scale for Testing Spelling Vocabulary.* Paul Stewart, public schools, Pasadena, Cal. Stanford University.
- A Study of Spelling Abilities.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.

PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION

- Philosophy of Education* (text). J. H. Coursault, University of Missouri.
- Froebel's Educational Theories.* William H. Kilpatrick, Columbia University.
- Professional Ethics.* F. E. Thompson, University of Colorado.

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, MISCELLANEOUS

- The Effect of College Training on General Efficiency.* S. J. Bole, University of Illinois.
- Factors Involved in the Problem of Study.* A. L. Hallquest, University of Illinois.
- The Sequence of Topics in Psychology.* L. W. Sackett, University of Texas.
- A Sammelbericht on Adolescence.* Bird T. Baldwin, Swarthmore College.
- A Textbook on Adolescence.* Bird T. Baldwin, Swarthmore College.
- The Mental Traits of Adolescent Negro Girls.* Ruth Marshall and Verna Way, Swarthmore College.
- Language Development of the Adolescent.* F. E. Bolton, University of Washington.

- Motor and Speech Development of a Child during the First Two Years of Life.* H. Hale Swift, University of Washington.
- A Survey of the Talented Children in Certain Public Schools of California.* L. M. Terman, Stanford University.
- Correlation between Different Forms of Retentiveness.* V. A. C. Henmon, University of Wisconsin.
- The Analytical Functions of the Drawing Process.* Fred C. Ayer, University of Oregon.
- An Experimental Study of Mechanical Construction.* J. Carleton Bell, University of Texas.
- A Case of Unusual Ability in Multiplication.* F. S. Breed, University of Michigan.
- Psycho-analytical Studies in the Origin and Breaking of Individual Habits.* Charles H. Johnston, University of Illinois.
- Anthropological-Physiological Study of Five Hundred Individuals in a State Reformatory.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Experimental-Critical Investigation of Habit-Formation in a Series of Motor and Sensory Tests.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Experimental Investigation of Moral Judgments in Public-School Children.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Experimental Study of Physical and Psycho-physical Periodicity.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- An Experimental-Critical Study of Psychopathic Constitution.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Experimental Investigation of Fatigue and Attention.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- A Study in Moral Judgment in Public-School Children.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Cephalic Indices of American and Foreign School Children.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Learning Curves for Two Adult Beginners in Piano Playing.* Charles H. Johnston, University of Illinois.
- The Relationship of the Abilities of University Students as Measured by Certain Mental Tests with Their Scholastic Standings.* I. King, State University of Iowa.
- The Relation of School Standings to the Degree of Physiological Maturity.* I. King, State University of Iowa.
- Resemblances of Siblings in Intellect.* E. L. Thorndike, Columbia University.
- The Psychology of the Cigarette, an Experimental Study.* Charles H. Johnston, University of Illinois.
- The Interrelations of Ten Ideals of Two Hundred College Students for a Period of Thirty Days.* Charles H. Johnston, University of Illinois.

- An Investigation of the Intellectual Abilities and Vocational Interests of Wayward Girls in the Wisconsin Industrial School.* M. V. O'Shea, University of Wisconsin.
- Psychological Study of Delinquent Girls.* Elmer E. Jones, Indiana University.
- Correlation of Mental Abilities in School Subjects of Girls' High School.* Principal D. E. Weglein, Western High School, Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University.
- Individual Differences in Association.* Glentworth M. Willson, Alfred University.
- Anthropological Study of City and Country Children.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- Individual Differences in Adults in Methods of Memorizing and in the Practical Use of the Memory.* I. King, University of Iowa.
- Habit-Formation in the Light of Experimental Investigation.* James E. Lough, New York University.
- An Experimental Analysis of the Meaning of Personality.* L. W. Sackett, University of Texas.
- The Philosophy of Leadership.* L. W. Sackett, University of Texas.
- Social-Physiological Study of Five Hundred Individuals in a State Reformatory.* James E. Lough, New York University.

SCHOOL SURVEYS

- Comparative Study of the Organization of City School Systems in North Carolina.* H. W. Chase and L. A. Williams, University of North Carolina.
- A Survey of the School System of Sacramento, California.* E. P. Cubberley, Stanford University.
- The School System of Gary, Indiana.* (Will be published by the United States Bureau of Education.) W. P. Burris, University of Cincinnati.
- Survey of the Public Schools of Austin, Texas.* Elzy Dee Jennings, University of Texas.
- Child-Labor and Education in the County of Gaston, North Carolina.* E. R. Rankin, University of North Carolina.
- Proposed Reorganization of the School System of Placer County, California.* E. P. Cubberley, Stanford University.
- Proposed Reorganization of the School System of San Mateo County, California.* E. P. Cubberley, Stanford University.
- Educational Survey of Boone County, Missouri.* W. W. Charters, University of Missouri.
- Social and Educational Survey of Some Typical High Schools.* C. L. Holley, University of Illinois.
- Social Conditions in Minnesota High Schools.* E. H. Swift, University of Minnesota.
- Inspection of the Work of the Department of Economics in Harvard University.* Henry W. Holmes, Harvard University.

Descriptive Survey of Educational Periodicals. Fred C. Ayer, University of Oregon.

The Rating of Public Normal Schools in the South. Carter Alexander, Peabody College for Teachers.

TEACHING METHODS AND CURRICULUM

The Elementary-School Curriculum. J. L. Meriam, University of Missouri.

Determination of Minima in Elementary-School Subjects. W. C. Bagley, University of Illinois.

Economy and Hygiene of School Learning. James E. Lough, New York University.

Principles of Selection, Organization, and Presentation of Cognitive Material for Emotional Effects. B. F. Pittenger, University of Minnesota.

One Thousand Annotated References on Methods in Teaching. Dorothy N. Powell, Swarthmore College.

The Teaching of Civics in the Public Schools. E. F. Monroe, Shelton, Neb. University of Nebraska.

Experimental Study in Teaching High-School Chemistry. James E. Lough, New York University.

An Experimental Study of the Teaching of German to Beginners. James E. Lough, New York University.

The General Training Effects of the Specific Discipline of Descriptive Geometry. H. O. Rugg, University of Illinois.

Experimental-Critical Investigation in Teaching Geography. James E. Lough, New York University.

Grammar Curriculum in Grades Based upon Oral and Written Grammatical Errors of Pupils. W. W. Charters, University of Missouri.

A Comparative Study of the Results of Instruction in Vertical Handwriting and Instruction in the Palmer System. Henry W. Holmes, Harvard University.

Experimental-Critical Study of School Penmanship. James E. Lough, New York University.

Collegiate Credit for Physical Education in Universities and Colleges. Bird T. Baldwin, Swarthmore College.

Experimental Study of Beginning Reading in School. William W. Black, Indiana University.

The Basis of Pupils' Interest in Reading. L. W. Sackett, University of Texas.

Experimental Investigation of Reading in First Primary Grades. James E. Lough, New York University.

Experimental Investigation of Learning in Typewriting. James E. Lough, New York University.

The Time Element in Acquiring Simplified Spelling. W. T. Foster, Reed College.

Efficiency of the Spelling-Book. W. W. Charters, University of Missouri.

A Study of the Spelling Difficulty of One Thousand Common Words in the Seventh and Eighth Grades. Henry W. Holmes, Harvard University.

An Experimental Study of Spelling Including Individual Differences in Learning to Spell, the Critical Elements in Difficult Spelling, and the Typical Errors in Individual and Group Spelling. M. V. O'Shea, University of Wisconsin.

The Written Vocabulary of Graduates (a) of the High School, (b) of the Elementary School, (c) of the College, with a View to Determining the Chief Requirements in the Teaching of Spelling. M. V. O'Shea, University of Wisconsin.

Print versus Script in the Teaching of Spelling. C. S. Berry, University of Wisconsin.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY



1 1719 02753 7911

DO NOT REMOVE

CHARGE SLIP FROM THIS POCKET
IF SLIP IS LOST PLEASE RETURN BOOK
DIRECTLY TO A CIRCULATING LIBRARY MEMBER

